

The Biblical Review

PUBLISHED QUARTERLY BY THE
BIBLE TEACHERS TRAINING SCHOOL

WILBERT W. WHITE, *Editor*

ROBERT M. KURTZ, *Managing Editor*

Associate Editors:

JOHN L. DEARING, for Japan

JAMES S. GALE, for Korea

JOSHUA C. GARRITT, for China

AMUEL M. ZWEMER, for the Near East

JULIUS RICHTER, for Germany

*The general diffusion of the Bible is the most effectual way
to civilize and humanize mankind.*—CHANCELLOR KENT.

Vol. I.

JULY, 1916

No. 3

CONTENTS

EDITORIAL:	PAGE
BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION.....	325
THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL IN CHRISTIANITY. WILBERT W. WHITE.....	328
THE VERIFICATION OF CHRISTIANITY. LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.....	350
A BRIEF HISTORY OF HERESY. JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER.....	390
THE POWER OF THE WILL IN CONVERSION. JAMES H. SNOWDEN.....	429
NEW MATERIALS FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDY. JAMES HOPE MOULTON.....	442
COLLATERAL READINGS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS.....	451
LITERARY REVIEWS.....	457

THE SUBSCRIPTION PRICE OF THE BIBLICAL REVIEW IS ONE
DOLLAR a year, prepaid in American territory, in Canada, Mexico, and
Hawaii. For all other countries, add thirty cents postage. Single
copies, thirty cents. Receipt of subscription is indicated on the wrapper.
REMITTANCES should be sent by draft on New York, Express Order,
or Money Order, payable to THE BIBLICAL REVIEW.
CHANGE OF ADDRESS—For change, give both old and new addresses.

Address: THE BIBLICAL REVIEW
541 LEXINGTON AVENUE - - - NEW YORK, N. Y.

Entered as second-class matter, December 17, 1912, at the Post Office at
New York, New York, under the Act of August 24, 1912.
Copyright, 1916, by Bible Teachers Training School

THE BIBLE TEACHERS TRAINING SCHOOL

Its Character and Its Subordinate Schools

It is a Divinity School, evangelical, interdenominational, and intervocational, designed for the training of ministers and other Christian leaders and workers.

Governed by an interdenominational Board of Trustees.

Conducting the following group of Schools:

A School of Theology (with a three years course).

A School of Pedagogy (with a three years course).

A School of Missions (with a two years course).

A School for Bible Teachers (with a two years course).

A School for Graduates and for Special Students.

In all of these the Organizing Discipline is the study of the Bible in the student's mother-tongue, as the most important part of training for any kind of Christian activity.

The general standards and principles of the institution may be gathered from this statement concerning its School of Theology:

In the School of Theology the courses of study extend through three years. The Biblio-centric curriculum has been framed with the college graduate in mind.

In accordance with the organizing principle of the School as a whole, the basis of training is direct, intensive, and comprehensive study of the Bible in the mother-tongue. However, the curriculum includes a due proportion of study in the usual correlated departments of theological training.

Of the 1,373 required hours in the School of Theology, 589, or a little less than one-half, are devoted to direct systematic, progressive Bible study. In addition to the required hours, 115 hours must be elected, making 1,488 hours in all.

Condensation and effectiveness in presentation have been carefully studied, so that the enlarged place given to Bible study may not impair the efficiency of other disciplines.

Some of the lecturers on Homiletics are: Dr. D. J. Burrell, Dr. J. M. Farrar, Dr. C. L. Goodell, Dr. J. H. Jowett, and Dr. Cornelius Woelfkin.

Graduates are now in the ministry of over twelve denominations.

Having a clearly non-sectarian, interdenominational, and evangelical basis; carefully guarding against conscious bias and unnecessary antagonisms.

Avoiding the exploiting of negation, but standing for fundamentals in Biblical knowledge, and giving constant prominence to the great abiding spiritual forces, such as the reality and efficacy of prayer, the saving work of the risen and living Christ, and the influence and power of the Spirit and Word of God.

Employing the most approved educational methods.

Directing a special department for the training of workers among Italians, which has sent out into this important field forty-five ordained ministers of eight denominations and fifty-seven trained lay workers. These ministers have organized twenty-nine Italian churches and missions.

Developing an Extension Department which enrolled in the year 1915-1916 1,191 regular students, and conducted in addition several special classes having an enrollment of over one thousand.

Having a supervised Practical Work Department in which during the year 1915-1916 over two hundred and sixty-five appointments were filled by students weekly.

Publishing THE BIBLICAL REVIEW, quarterly, which has a circulation among leading workers throughout the world.

Affording also the great cultural advantages of a cosmopolitan company of students, representing (1915-1916) twenty-seven denominations, twenty-two countries, thirty-five states of the Union, and one hundred and eighteen universities, colleges, normal schools, and seminaries.

Possessing a carefully selected working Library of over nine thousand volumes in charge of a professional Librarian and staff.

With a Faculty of fourteen members who give full time to the work, together with a representative corps of special lecturers.

Officially endorsed and signally honored as a model by the Wanking School of Theology, the Foochow Union Theological School, and the Pierson Memorial Bible School, of Seoul, Korea.

Officially approved by two denominations in the home land as the training center for their ministry.

CATALOGUE AND OTHER LITERATURE SENT ON APPLICATION TO

WILBERT W. WHITE, *President*

BIBLE TEACHERS TRAINING SCHOOL
641 LEXINGTON AVENUE - - - - - NEW YORK

Our only safeguard amid the Babel of opinions around us is a fuller and more accurate knowledge of Holy Scripture. This alone will enable us to distinguish, in teaching new to us, the true from the false. And it is not too much to hope that such fuller knowledge will not only preserve us from disquietude, but will reveal to us a nearer and clearer view of the Son of God, and thus work in our hearts and lives a richer likeness to Him. And this is the true aim of all Biblical Scholarship.

JOSEPH AGAR BEET.

(St. Paul's Epistles to the Corinthians, Preface.)

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW

Vol. I

JULY, 1916

No. 3

EDITORIAL

BY WAY OF INTRODUCTION

IN HIS second paper upon The Verification of Christianity, Dr. Sweet proceeds to deal with his subject more specifically, after, as he says, having cleared the ground of preliminary difficulties in his first paper on this theme. It is not necessary to comment at length upon the further work of a writer so well known to our readers. They will follow him with special appreciation, after his preparatory paper, as he now proceeds to measure Christianity "as a psychological fact; that is, as a product of the human consciousness," and thereby develops his present argument for its verification.

This is the day of condensed information. Many desire to know who have scant time for any thorough study of their own or even for reading the more extensive results of the work done by thorough and painstaking scholars. The needs of busy men who require at least the essentials must not be ignored, and so we have the single article or the small volume where the specialist has a library. Experience has

shown that ministers and other students welcome brief yet comprehensive surveys of great subjects. Dr. Faulkner has undertaken the somewhat difficult task of bringing the history of the development and relationship of the chief heresies in Christian history within the limits of a single paper. It will serve the purpose of giving a good perspective of the field from the earliest days of the church until our own times, and in this way may well form a permanent addition to one's reference library.

The problem of the will, in its various relations to the Christian life, puzzles a vastly greater number of souls than those of theologians. Questions of responsibility for decision with respect to one's attitude toward God, Christ, the Scriptures, and moral conduct are constantly being brought to the front in Bible classes and private conversations. How can one be positively sure of the truth? If he cannot be, then how far is he responsible if he becomes discouraged in seeking it and gives up in despair, or if he labors under a misapprehension and decides wrongly? What teacher of adults has not faced these questions? Dr. Snowden's article upon *The Power of the Will in Conversion* will be found a means of no little aid upon just such points. We are living in a time when the will is too little appealed to, when the intellect is too often regarded as the chief determining factor in life. We need more concern with respect to the will as an element in life, and a clearer knowledge of its functions and possibilities. As a response to such a need this brief paper is a valuable contribution.

When the student of classic Greek turns to his Greek Testament, it is probable that he does not always have an adequate appreciation of the change

from one literary form to another involved in the act. Professor Moulton contributes a very clear account of the differences between the language of the Attic poets, historians, and dramatists we translated in college and that of the New Testament writers. The work of Professor Deissmann, with that of the explorers who unearthed the priceless papyri, is briefly reviewed and its importance for students of the New Testament clearly denoted. Professor Moulton, as he says, writes en route to the East, and this would explain the absence from his paper of more instances of the changes he refers to, since the lack of library facilities must render such detail impossible. While this may account for an impression of incompleteness in his contribution, it has not prevented his giving us a delightfully clear narrative of the discoveries and investigations that have so greatly enriched our knowledge of the linguistic origin of our New Testament.

THE SUPREME COURT OF APPEAL IN CHRISTIANITY

By WILBERT W. WHITE

Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel.—2 TIMOTHY 2:8.

THESE words, I believe, suggest the right answer to an important question of current interest, which was once put to me in the following form: "What is the Supreme Court of Appeal in Christianity—the church, the human reason, or the Bible?"

Three great names are representative of these three positions. John Henry Newman stands for the view that the church is the supreme court of appeal, James Martineau represents the doctrine that reason is king, and Charles Spurgeon is a spokesman for those who hold the Bible to be the final standard in morals and life. A sentence of Spurgeon's about the Bible is: "Let us make every effort to know truth better, but we must make up our minds to begin with that we shall never know better truth." Adolph Monod is with Spurgeon when he says: "If faith has not for its basis a testimony of God to which we must submit as to an authority exterior to our own personal judgment, and independent of it, then faith is no faith. * * * The more I study the Scriptures, the example of Jesus Christ and the Apostles, and the history of my own heart, the more I am convinced

that a testimony of God placed without us and above
ss * * * and received with submission on the sole
authority of God, is the true basis of faith."

These three views rather represent three groups of
views. There are different shades of belief included
in each. There are several kinds of high churchmen,
one being the *Lux Mundi* type which holds that the
church must interpret because the Bible is not infalli-
ble. This is to be distinguished from the Roman
Catholic Church position which holds that the Bible
is infallible, but that the infallible interpretation is
mediated by the church. There is a type of high
churchman, also, represented by the modern critical
school, strange to say. They are those who take the
position that only scholars are competent to interpret
the Bible. They are as dogmatic and dictatorial as
Rome dare be.

On the other hand, the group represented by the
human reason consists of various shades, ranging all
the way from the coldest, baldest rationalism to the
warmest, most pronounced mysticism. Such move-
ments as Montanism, Anabaptism, and Pietism are
classifiable here. Dr. Warfield, in reviewing a recent
book on Mysticism and Modern Life, refers to a type
of mysticism which is "a pantheising anti-super-
naturalistic religiousness which must not be permitted
to come to us in sheep's clothing of 'essential Chris-
tianity' on the ground that it is only another name
for 'spiritual inwardness.'" In speaking of mysticism
on the one hand, and rationalism on the other, Dr.
Warfield further strikingly says that both turn away
from "external authority." "The difference between
them is very much a matter of temperament, or perhaps
we may even say of temperature. * * * Warm up

a Rationalist and you inevitably get a Mystic; chill down a Mystic and you find yourself with a Rationalist on your hands."

Dr. Forsyth asserts that "the chief peril of our day is a soft, uncharted subjectivism." A writer calls attention to one thing that troubles him because of its symbolism. In a certain village, which on the whole is a very pleasant, amiable, well-informed, and progressive town, "the church spire is tipped by a weather vane; iron rods diverging from a center, bear gilded letters, N., E., S., W., which point this way and that, veering with every wind that blows. It is a highly sensitive weather vane, and reflects with delicate accuracy the shifting of the little breezes, and lesser currents of the upper air." "It is unpleasantly suggestive," he continues, "of faith rationalized, faith that is a matter of changing thought." "When," he asks, "will the churches take off the weather vanes, and leave their spires pointing to the stars?"

We are reminded of a recent saying of Dr. J. D. Jones of London: "I confess to you, I catch myself often wishing for a touch of the apostolic narrowness. I do not want any other sort. I am not at all sure that the church nowadays has not become so broad that it has lost its driving power."

One would conclude from many sermons and magazine articles and books of to-day that the Bible is still in the making. Here is a sample deliverance of one recognized by many as an oracle in religious matters: "We do not believe that the disciples are to go back to the tenth century or to the first century to get a creed. We hold that the disciples in the twentieth century are better able to frame a creed, if creed be wanted, than the disciples of the first century.

Truth is a great mosaic, to which our generation is to make its separate contribution." Still more radical in this same line are the following words of a brilliant preacher: "There is no land beneath the sun where you have the moral right to pledge yourself to-day to believe the same thing to-morrow. As for myself, I know that I would not sign a creed even though I had written it myself."

Pastor Robinson, of the Puritan Fathers, is often erroneously interpreted in the well-known quotation: "The Lord hath more truth and light yet to break forth out of his Holy Word." The context of that sentiment clearly indicates that Pastor Robinson did not intend to teach that men are as inspired to-day to write for the Biblical Canon as they were in Biblical times. Perhaps he would recognize that they are as much inspired now as in Biblical times for certain things, but certainly not inspired to write additions to the Bible; that is, to communicate new and revolutionary truth such as would lead us to repudiate the Bible as the supreme standard. Men are inspired now for many things, but not to write any more Bible. They are inspired to interpret the Bible for the times and to live it themselves. The analogy between the Bible and the Constitution of the United States may help us here. The Supreme Court of the United States is not legislative in its function. It is its business to interpret each legislative act in the light of the Constitution, its supreme guide. The supreme judges may not take liberties with it. Their business is to interpret it. Their question constantly is: Is this new law which has been enacted constitutional? So the individual Christian and the Christian group, small or large, must ask: Is this or that position

Biblical? What say the Scriptures? One has recently put this very clearly thus:

For many centuries the principal means of bringing men to the knowledge of God has been the record found in the Bible of his self-revelation by intervention, and of the impressions made by this revelation on the minds of men. The record assumes the revelation as an empirical fact, known to the actual experience of men in many ways from the time of the first man Adam to that of the last surviving apostle of Christ. It is all one revelation, in successive stages and many forms, progressively continuous, cumulative and enriched by all its additions; but now completed or suspended or intermitted until its future resumption when the time arrives. The completion however is only of this overt or miraculous revelation; for all the common forms of revelation are perpetual. These include the spiritual illumination of all those who meet its conditions in repentance and faith, and due heed to the testimony given. In this sense revelation is continuous to this day.

The spiritual illumination thus within reach adds no new element of truth to the old record, but enlightens the believer's mind in the old truth; and, precisely in the measure that the prescribed conditions are fulfilled, makes all that truth a great and rich and living reality; in this measure and no more. It is open to all men to fulfil these conditions, and gain a knowledge of what has been revealed, knowledge that in its measure is experimental. By this means and to this extent theology, which is primarily an historical science, may become incidentally an experimental science, through the assimilation and application to life of that testimony which is its foundation. In this way Christian experience, in the degree of its maturity, acquires secondary and corroborative data for the science of theology, supplementing the primary data found in the testimony of the primary witnesses to the overt revelation. In proportion to its maturity Christian experience corroborates that ancient testimony, and does so in many ways. The evidence of this can be found in the Christian biography of all the centuries and in many living witnesses to-day. There are forms of theology now in vogue that reverse this order, and seek primary data in the more rudimental

elements of experience at the present time. This meager, modern experience is then made the test by which to judge the experience of the Hebrew prophets and apostles.¹

It appears clear that the three views above mentioned represent two extremes and a mean. The extremes are those personified in Newman and Martineau. They might be characterized as the Romanistic and the Rationalistic views. The mediating, or middle ground, view may be called the Radial. This word is selected because it suggests uniform and comprehensive development on all sides from a center. If we should take any one of these views exclusively, this is the one we should adopt, because it draws to itself, organizes, unifies, and comprehends, as we believe, all the truth found in the other two views. It recognizes that reason must be given her full rights on the one hand, and that the informing and warning voice of the church is to be given due heed on the other.

The Radial position holds that the church is to teach, but that the Bible is to prove. The church itself must be brought to the tribunal of the Bible. The Bible, this view maintains, is the authority consistent with the highest reason. "The unreconstructed Christianity of the Bible as it stands," says Rankin in the article just quoted, "is all within the bounds of pure reason. As a unitary scheme of revelation it not only agrees with all self-evident truth, but is demanded by self-evident truth." It welcomes thought. Just before the words of Timothy, quoted at the outset, Paul wrote: "Consider what I say; for the Lord shall give thee understanding." The Christian

¹Henry William Rankin, *Philosophy and the Problem of Revelation*, Princeton Theological Review, April, 1916, p. 306f.

of the Pauline type takes every opportunity to encourage investigation, to do hard thinking, to possess openness of mind, carefully to weigh evidence. It should be repeatedly emphasized that, in taking the position that the Bible is the final standard, the only rule of faith and practice, it is understood that the whole Bible and the Bible as a whole is in mind, and that each part is to be interpreted in the light of the whole. We must guard against the analytic tendency of the modern mind, "which often disintegrates what depends for its virtue on being kept whole and entire."

The organizing teaching of the Bible is its doctrine of God. A Christlike God is presented in the Old Testament, and a Godlike Christ is found in the New Testament. These two, who are really one, constitute the Biblical doctrine of God and forever authenticate the Bible as true. The truth in the Bible is an organism, having its roots, its stem, its branches, its fruits. It is, as it were, a body, having hands, feet, head, and heart. While all is essential and inspired, some parts are profitable for one thing and other parts for other things. The Bible is for all time and for all kinds of people, for all climes, all countries, all ages.

It is very important to recognize also the emphasis which those who accept the Bible as the final standard place upon the guidance of the Holy Spirit. One great representative church creed on this point is as follows:

The authority of the Holy Scripture, for which it ought to be believed and obeyed, dependeth not upon the testimony of any man or church, but wholly upon God (who is truth itself), the author thereof. * * * Our full persuasion and assurance of

^aDenney, 2 Corinthians, Expositors' Commentary, p. 163.

the infallible truth, and divine authority thereof, is from the inward work of the Holy Spirit, bearing witness by and with the word in our hearts.

The words of Müller, the great apostle and demonstrator of the life of trust of the last generation, are illuminating here:

God then began to show me that the word of God alone is our standard of judgment in spiritual things; that it can be explained only by the Holy Spirit; and that in our day, as well as in former times, He is the Teacher of His people. The office of the Holy Spirit I had not experimentally understood before that time.

Coming now, in the light of our text, directly to attempt an answer to the question: "What is the final standard in Christianity?" I would reply: It is Jesus Christ as interpreted and lived by His apostles, especially and notably as His doctrine and life are elaborated and illustrated in the writings and career of the Apostle Paul.

"Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel."

In justification of this proposition, I submit the following:

First: The goal or objective of Paul's Gospel is perfection—the perfect individual, the perfect family, the perfect community, the world perfected—and he all the time thinks of this perfection as illustrated in and realizable by Jesus Christ. "I press on," he says, "if so be that I may lay hold on that for which also I was laid hold on by Christ Jesus. * * * I press on toward the goal unto the prize of the high calling of God in Christ Jesus." To be saved, according to Paul, is to pursue a manner of life worthy of the

Gospel of Christ (Phil. 1:27); it is to be "filled with the fruits of righteousness, which are through Jesus Christ, unto the glory and praise of God" (Phil. 1:11); it is to be becoming blameless and harmless, children of God without blemish in the midst of a crooked and perverse generation; it is to be found in Christ, to know Him and the power of His resurrection; it is ultimately to be fully like Jesus Christ, having this body of humiliation fashioned anew and "conformed to the body of his glory, according to the working whereby he is able even to subject all things unto himself" (Phil. 3:20).

These words, all from the Epistle to the Philippians, fairly represent Paul's teaching in all his thirteen letters. In his letter to the Colossians he says: "Christ in you, the hope of glory: whom we proclaim, admonishing every man and teaching every man in all wisdom, that we may present every man perfect in Christ" (1:27, 28). So much for Paul's goal.

Second: Think now of the motive which animated Paul, and which he commends as the secret of realizing this perfection, of reaching the goal. This motive is love. In the same Epistle to the Philippians he commends *the mind of Christ as the standard mind*. "Doing nothing," says he, "through faction or through vainglory, but in lowliness of mind each counting other better than himself; not looking each of you to his own things, but each of you also to the things of others. Have this mind in you, which was also in Christ Jesus" (Phil. 2:3-5). We recall here that matchless thirteenth chapter of First Corinthians, wherein love is declared to be the greatest of those three things which abide. Does not the mere statement of this motive commend itself as the highest

imaginable? Can we think that ever in the future there will be disclosed anything more powerfully operative? Dr. Gordon, of Boston, recently spoke on *The Predictable in Christian Faith*. Will any goal beyond Paul's ambition ever be imaginable? Will any higher or more potent motive than love ever be announced?

Third: Not only is the goal at which Paul aims ultimate and perfect and the motive supreme and powerful; the method also which he discloses is unique and ideal. Of this it may be said in a special sense that it is not of man. Salvation by grace, as preached by Paul, is such as no human philosopher has ever conceived effective. This method of grace, this way of the cross, this response to the call to come without money and without price, this command: "Let the wicked forsake his way, and the unrighteous man his thoughts; and let him return unto Jehovah, and he will have mercy upon him; and to our God, for he will abundantly pardon," is in direct contrast to man's method of salvation, which is always conceived to be by his own effort. Ruskin truly says: "I believe that the root of almost every schism and heresy from which the Christian church has ever suffered has been the effort of man to earn, rather than to receive his salvation; and that the reason that preaching is commonly so ineffective is that it calls on men oftener to work for God than to behold God working for them." Paul certainly would subscribe to those words of Ruskin. He would refer to his own schismatic career as persecutor of the church in illustration of the zeal of one intent on gaining salvation by works.

Referring again to that matchless love letter, the Epistle to the Philippians, we read a summary of

Paul's experience with the two methods, the law method and the grace method, and no man in history can be cited who tested more thoroughly these two methods than Paul himself. "I myself," he writes, "might have confidence even in the flesh: if any other man thinketh to have confidence in the flesh, I yet more: circumcised the eighth day, of the stock of Israel, of the tribe of Benjamin, a Hebrew of Hebrews; as touching the law, a Pharisee; as touching zeal, persecuting the church; as touching the righteousness which is in the law, found blameless. Howbeit what things were gain to me, these things have I counted loss for Christ. Yea verily, and I count all things to be loss for the excellency of the knowledge of Christ Jesus my Lord: for whom I suffered the loss of all things, and do count them but refuse, that I may gain Christ, and be found in him, not having a righteousness of mine own, even that which is of the law, but that which is through faith in Christ, the righteousness which is from God by faith" (3:4-9).

Another notable declaration in this same line is found in his letter to the Romans, where he says: "What the law could not do [namely, make free from the law of sin and death], in that it was weak through the flesh, God, sending his own Son in the likeness of sinful flesh and for sin, condemned sin in the flesh: that the ordinance of the law might be fulfilled in us, who walk not after the flesh, but after the spirit" (8:3, 4).

Fourth: As for the standard model, Paul does not hesitate to refer to himself as a representative demonstration of the power of Jesus Christ in producing a disciple. After that great declaration of renunciation of all things for Christ, and announcement

of purpose to forget the things behind, and to press toward the goal, he says: "Brethren, be ye imitators together of me, and mark them that so walk even as ye have us for an ensample." And again: "The things which ye both learned and received and heard and saw in me, these things do: and the God of peace shall be with you" (Phil. 4:9).

It is impossible here to dwell upon Paul as a model disciple. In passing I should like to refer to his "consciousness of the dimensions of life"—his perspective—as one characteristic worthy of our ambition. Paul was not only Biblical, he was cosmopolitan, and the latter largely because of the former.

Fifth: Recently I was struck anew by the contrast between Paul and Felix, as given us in the twenty-fourth chapter of the Acts, the citation of which leads us to the fifth consideration, namely, the content of Paul's Gospel, the facts and doctrines growing out of these facts which so powerfully influenced Paul and enabled him to live his marvelous life. We read that "Felix came, with Drusilla, his wife, who was a Jewess, and sent for Paul, and heard him concerning the faith in Christ Jesus. And as he reasoned of righteousness, and self-control, and the judgment to come, Felix was terrified, and answered: Go thy way for this time; and when I have a convenient season, I will call thee unto me. He hoped withal that money would be given him of Paul: wherefore also he sent for him the oftener, and communed with him. But when two years were fulfilled, Felix was succeeded by Porcius Festus; and desiring to gain favor with the Jews, Felix left Paul in bonds" (vs. 24-27). What an illustration of contradictions in Felix, desiring to gain favor with the Jews, hoping that Paul would give him money to

secure his release, terrified as Paul reasons of righteousness, self-control, and the judgment to come. Here is a sample worldly life in contrast with Paul's life as a sample of the other worldly life, the life which recognizes its citizenship as in Heaven, the life which has as its goal to be like Christ, its motive love, its method grace.

Paul strides this earth like a colossus. No man, except perhaps Moses, has exerted like or greater influence. What is the explanation? Inquiring into the secret springs of this life, we discover that they are a series of facts in the career of Jesus Christ organizing themselves around the great fact and culminating miracle of the New Testament, the resurrection of this same Jesus Christ. Our verse reads: "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David, according to my gospel." This fact, I suppose, is the organizing fact of Paul's theology because of his own personal experience with Jesus Christ, he having come first into contact with Him as the risen Saviour. On that road to Damascus Paul saw Jesus and heard Him speak. This vision he never was out of sight of. For instance, before Agrippa and his associates, years afterward, in relating his experience, he reports: "I said, Who art thou, Lord? And the Lord said, I am Jesus whom thou persecutest. But arise, and stand upon thy feet: for to this end have I appeared unto thee, to appoint thee a minister and a witness both of the things wherein thou hast seen me, and of the things wherein I will appear unto thee" (Acts 26:15, 16). Later, in this same valiant defence before Agrippa, he says: "Having therefore obtained the help that is from God, I stand unto this day testifying both to small and great, saying nothing but what the prophets

and Moses did say should come; how that the Christ must suffer, and how that he first by the resurrection of the dead should proclaim light both to the people and to the Gentiles" (26:22, 23).

An examination of the recorded sermons, addresses, and letters of Paul will reveal how prominent in his thought is the resurrection. From this he goes backward to the doctrine of the atonement in the fact of the cross, to the doctrine of the incarnation in the fact of the supernatural birth, to the doctrine of the Deity of our Lord in the fact of His pre-existent and eternal relation as Son to the Father. Proceeding in the other direction from the resurrection, he presents conspicuously in his teaching the facts of the ascension and accompanying glorification of our Lord, His powerful and continuous operation by His Spirit in our behalf as intercessor at the right hand of the Majesty on high, and His coming again to judge the world and to establish His everlasting rule of righteousness and peace on earth.

(For elaboration and application, see such passages in Paul's writings as Romans 5:1-11; Romans 8; Colossians 1; Ephesians 2; Galatians 4; Titus 3; 1 Corinthians 15; 2 Corinthians 5.)

We are challenged by the striking resemblance, in respect to the prominence of Jesus Christ, between these Pauline messages and that given in the Apostles' Creed. Note the wording: "I believe in God the Father Almighty, Maker of heaven and earth. And in Jesus Christ his only Son, our Lord; who was conceived by the Holy Ghost, born of the Virgin Mary; suffered under Pontius Pilate; was crucified, dead, and buried; he descended into the grave; the third day he rose from the dead; he ascended into heaven,

and sitteth on the right hand of God the Father, Almighty; from thence he shall come to judge the quick and the dead. I believe in the Holy Ghost; the Holy Catholic Church; the Communion of Saints; the Forgiveness of Sins; the Resurrection of the Body, and the Life Everlasting. Amen."

In this connection the words of Patrick Fairbairn are pertinent:

The facts which made up the earthly career of Christ necessarily become, on being completed, *doctrines*, and as such were preached in the name of Christ by apostles, and by the Holy Spirit were sealed upon the understandings and hearts of men. * * * (The Gospel in its completed form is the facts of His mediatorial work in their spiritual bearing and personal application, completed under the direction of Christ Himself, by the Spirit He gave and the instrumentality He appointed.) Contemplated merely as facts or as historical events, they stand outside of us, and may leave us *morally* much as we were. But when apprehended as doctrine, or appropriated by faith as the elements of saving knowledge, they enter into our consciousness; they touch the springs of thought and feeling in our bosoms; they form the ground of new aspirations, the motives of a new and higher life. Without the facts, indeed, the doctrine might swim in the air; but without being seen in their doctrinal import, the facts would not be spirit and life to the soul.

We thus perceive the absurdity of attempting to separate Christianity from doctrine. * * *

Have I faith in Christ as the Son of God and Saviour of the world? Then I hold the doctrine of the Incarnation and realize its importance.

Have I faith in the death of Christ, as the ground of my reconciliation with God? Then I hold the doctrine of the cross, or of a crucified Redeemer, as the one thing needful to my peace and hope.

Have I faith in Christ as the conqueror of death, the resurrection and the life? Then I embrace Him as the source of a new and undying life, beginning here and perfected in eternity.

Have I faith in Christ as ready to come again and appear on the throne of judgment? Then I hold the doctrine of the second advent, and recognize its bearing on my personal condition and destiny. Thus Christianity as a doctrine is the root of Christianity as a life; reject it in the one respect, and you cut the sinews of its vitality and strength in the other.³

In further explanation and support of the position that the apostolic interpretation and illustration in the life of Jesus Christ, especially that given by Paul, is the standard in Christianity, consider:

First: The interpretation of Jesus Christ in teaching and life as given by Paul is in complete harmony with the teachings of the other apostles, as presented in their epistles. It is true that only one-sixth of the epistolary material in the New Testament was produced by the other apostles, James, Peter, Jude, and John; five-sixths are Paul's; but these four others—five, indeed, if we include the Epistle to the Hebrews, written by an unknown author—these five, agree perfectly with the Pauline exposition as to goal, motive, method, and content.

Second: These epistles of the apostles are true interpretations of Jesus Christ as He is presented to us in the four Gospels. Some nowadays, it is true, would have us follow them in the call: "Back to Christ," by which they mean a repudiation of apostolic interpretation. These forget, apparently, that the four Gospels, with all that they contain of Christ's teachings, have come to us through the same apostolic minds which produced the epistles. These all are parts of the same stream of thought. They were poured into history in the same supreme, culminating time when our great Bible was finished.

³The Pastoral Epistles, Appendix A, pp. 412, 413.

On this point of the relation of the apostolic interpretation to our Lord's own teaching, Archbishop Whately, in his *Difficulties in the Writings of St. Paul*, discourses judiciously as follows:

How, indeed, could our Lord, during his abode on the earth, preach fully that scheme of salvation of which the keystone had not been laid, even his meritorious sacrifice as an atonement for sin, his resurrection from the dead, and ascension into glory, when these events had not taken place? He did indeed darkly hint at these events in his discourses to his disciples (and to them alone) by way of prophecy; but we are told that "the saying was hid from them, and they comprehended it not, till after that Christ was risen from the dead." Of course, therefore, there was no reason, and no room, for Him to enter into a full discussion of the doctrines dependent on those events. He left them to be enlightened in due time as to the true nature of His Kingdom, by the gift which He kept in store for them (the Holy Spirit).

* * * Our Lord's discourses, therefore, while on earth, though they teach, of course, the truth, do not teach, nor could have been meant to teach, the *whole* truth, as afterward revealed to his disciples. * * * What chance, then, can they have of attaining true Christian knowledge, who shut their eyes to such obvious conclusions as these?—who, under that idle plea, the misapplication of the maxim that "the disciple is not above his master," confine their attention entirely to the discourses of Christ recorded in the four Gospels, as containing all necessary truth; and if anything in the other parts of the Sacred Writings is forced upon their attention, studiously explain it away, and limit its signification, at all hazards, so that it may not go one step beyond what is clearly revealed in the words of the evangelists?—as if a man should, in the culture of a fruit tree, carefully destroy and reject, as a spurious excrescence, every part of the fruit which was not fully developed in the blossom that preceded it!

Following these sensible words of Whately, it may be well to note the strong asseverations by Paul on different occasions, that he had received His mes-

*Essay II, section 2.

sage quite as directly from Jesus Christ Himself as the other apostles had done. A sample statement to this effect is found in his letter to the Galatians, first chapter, where he speaks of "the gospel which was preached by me, that it is not after man. For neither did I receive it from man, nor was I taught it, but it came to me through revelation of Jesus Christ" (vs. 11, 12). In that same Epistle he shows that he had not had opportunity to receive this Gospel from the others, and also that he had been approved in his preaching of the Gospel by the others. Add to this the emphasis in the apostolic report of our Lord's own teaching, that He would be, by His Spirit, after His going away, in their midst and in them as the supreme Teacher. He told them that He had many things to say which they could not then bear, and the most comprehensive interpretation of the New Testament writings will lead us, we believe, to conclude that Jesus was recognized as in the midst of His people, by His Holy Spirit both teaching and powerfully working.

Further observe that our Lord, in turn, appealed to what went before in a similar manner to the apostles as they appealed back to the Lord. He emphasizes the fact that He did not bring a new message, one contrary to that of the prophets. He rather insisted that He brought the true interpretation of the old message. He came to fulfil the Law and the Prophets, not to destroy them. In this statement He has before Him the figure of the plant. From the roots and stock, having been growing for many centuries, were to be seen in Him, His teaching and life, and in the apostolic interpretation and illustration of that teaching, the ear and the full corn in the ear. We should here think also of the frequent mention of

Moses and the prophets by the apostles as well as appeal to our Lord's teachings. They, like our Lord, went back to the Old Testament. At your earliest opportunity study Paul's first recorded sermon as an example of his comprehensive view of the relation of Jesus Christ to the past and to the future. It is found in Acts 13. There he traces the Messianic idea from Abraham through David to John the Baptist.

We cannot too much emphasize the importance of studying how the Bible came into existence, in our consideration of its right to be regarded in the sense declared here, as the full and final Magna Charta for the world. The Bible was a long time in the making, and it was tested as it came. Bateson in his book on Darwin and Modern Science (1909) says that no one can survey the work of recent years without perceiving that evolutionary orthodoxy developed too fast, and that a great deal has got to come down. Not so did Christian orthodoxy spring into existence. Strikingly unlike the Bible of the Mohammedans, which was produced by one man in one generation, the Bible was produced slowly, each part of it having been thoroughly tested in its own time of production, each part having been produced in a very real sense from that which preceded it. Through study of the former prophets and of the history of their times, combined with prayer and a devout life, each prophet added his increment to the sacred writings. Thus the Bible as it came into existence was tested in every part, very much as the books of formulæ in physics have come into existence, or as the accredited handbooks used in the electrical world to-day have been produced by hundreds and thousands of experiments from the time of Franklin to Edison's latest discovery. Then for

nineteen hundred years the Bible has been tested and found true in every instance when dealt with on truly scientific, that is to say, experimental, principles.

The fundamental creeds of Christianity are supported by a consensus of testimony and a range of corroboration such as no modern science has acquired; and despite all the opposition they have suffered, largely as a result of that opposition, they are more easily and more cogently defended to-day than ever before since they were framed. It is want of adequate attention to their evidence, and nothing else, unless the moral grounds of that neglect, that leaves them discredited by any man.⁵

We return to the text for a word about the expression, "of the seed of David." In this Paul looks backward from Jesus Christ to David, and when he mentions David we are led to take another leap through the centuries back to Abraham. This Jesus Christ is the Son of David, the Son of Abraham, the originator in His Spirit of the promises to Abraham and to David, the Heir in the incarnation of the promises given to these two great men.

Paul also is thinking of the future when he says: "Remember Jesus Christ, risen from the dead, of the seed of David." Looking forward from the incarnation and the resurrection, we anticipate the glorious future which the fulfilment of the promise of God to David's Son holds for Jesus Christ, and through Him for the world. It is none other than that which is presented in Paul's remarkable summary of the past and of the future of our Lord in that same love letter from which we have quoted more than once, a summary occasioned by a most practical and apparently comparatively insignificant difference between two women in the church at Phillipi: "Have this mind in you,

⁵Henry William Rankin, *Princeton Theological Review*, April, 1916, p. 297.

which was also in Christ Jesus: who, existing in the form of God, counted not the being on an equality with God a thing to be grasped, but emptied himself, taking the form of a servant, being made in the likeness of men; and being found in fashion as a man, he humbled himself, becoming obedient even unto death, yea, the death of the cross. Wherefore also God highly exalted him, and gave unto him the name which is above every name; that at the name of Jesus every knee should bow, of things in heaven and things on earth and things under the earth, and that every tongue should confess that Jesus Christ is Lord, to the glory of God the Father" (2:5-11).

In the light of our study we are convinced that so far as the substance of the Gospel is concerned there is no new teaching to appear. It is rather a new application in life of a teaching already given. With Professor Gustav Warneck, of Halle, in his open letter to the Edinburgh Missionary Conference, we hold:

We dare not allow ourselves to be betrayed into the mistake of altering the content of the Gospel message as it was proclaimed by the apostles. It is universally acknowledged how great at home to-day is the danger of undermining the trustworthiness of the Biblical Gospel by a destructive criticism, as well as of rationalizing and thereby attenuating its content by modernism. But we should be deceiving ourselves if we refused to perceive that this danger is beginning to threaten us also upon the mission field. And upon this rationalistic depletion of the content of the apostolic Gospel there certainly follows, as is already at this moment the case in Japan, the second, perhaps almost graver danger of syncretism. This of course is not merely a question of missionary method, but a crucial question of missionary life. For in the Gospel of Christ, as it was proclaimed by the apostles and proved by them to be the power of God unto salvation to every-

one that believeth, there lies not only the living force to inspire the missionary life at home but also the power of regeneration for the non-Christian world. The main source of our strength is not in the method but in the message of this Gospel, in the messengers proclaiming it in the fulness of faith, and in the Christians who have become new creatures thereby. And power will go forth from this great assembly if it confesses this Gospel in a unanimous testimony.

The predictable in Christianity is this, that in proportion as the people of God know and obey the message of the Gospel, as it is presented to us in the Holy Scriptures, interpreted in all the light which reason and the consensus of convictions of all the godly can bestow—in proportion as this is done will the Kingdom of God advance in the world and the time be hastened when Jesus Christ shall come to His own and

* * * reign where'er the sun
Does his successive journeys run.

NEW YORK.

THE VERIFICATION OF CHRISTIANITY

(SECOND PAPER)

By LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET, S. T. D., Professor of Christian Theology
and Apologetics, Bible Teachers Training School

IN THE first and preliminary stage of this discussion we were chiefly concerned with the process of verification as such. We made very slight use of the theoretical principles developed in the course of the investigation, for the reason that our main purpose was to clear the ground of preliminary difficulties and *a priori* objections. We did this somewhat laboriously in order that we might clearly discern, in outline at least, the proper field within which we are to make application of the general laws of verification, to arrive at so much of rational conviction as, in the premises, we have a right to expect. We now propose to enter and occupy a portion of the field thus defined. Our first task is to measure Christianity *in limine* as a psychological fact—that is, as a product of the human consciousness. Wherever our task may ultimately lead, here it certainly begins. Whatever else it may be, however much more it may be, Christianity is indubitably a product of the human consciousness. We wish to study it as such, and, at the outset, as such alone. Having once laid hold upon the mental phenomena, we may reasonably attempt to fathom its significance, test its reality, fit it into our general scheme of thought and life. But to the mental facts first.

We naturally turn here to our extant records of Christian origins. In so doing we make no demands

upon the historicity of any narrative. Call the New Testament, in its entirety, legend, myth or dogma, it yet is the literary expression of the thought of its writers, and as such we wish to examine it. What did the New Testament writers think concerning Jesus, and what light does their witness throw upon the human consciousness in its relationship to God?

The first fact which strikes us upon opening the New Testament is that, though still in the flesh, we are in an ideal world—a world of God. This world of truth, of law, of righteousness, having its center in God, is looked upon as actualized in the person of Jesus Christ, a historic and human personality. The first word of the New Testament is a word of fulfilment: The “kingdom of God *is at hand.*” And this Kingdom is at hand in the person of Jesus; the historic *human* process has arrived at completion in the arrival of Him in whom that process is fulfilled. Whatever the New Testament writers believe as to those elements in the person of Jesus which transcend the human category, they assuredly believe in the reality and sincerity of His human life. Whatever they believe concerning the Divine Being He was, they also believe (and with full assurance) in the human being which He became.

Their convictions concerning the Incarnate One, His mysterious past, His glorious future, His enthroned and illimitable power, His invisible and immortal kingship, rest upon the immovable conviction of His genuine incarnation. His advent is a birth, His life a development, His obscure and toilsome youth and manhood a preparation, His ministry a task, His victory an achievement. He was and remained to them the perfect man. To the end of the Apostolic Age He

was the man Christ Jesus (1 Tim. 2:5). His story, therefore, becomes a doctrine of man, an interpretation of human life, an utterance of the religious consciousness of surpassing interest and worth. Jesus, therefore, is the ideal man who is the fulfilment and realization of the historic process conceived of as the progressive utterance of God's thought of man having its natural realization in the man of God's thought.

One by one these great ideas emerge as we read the story. Jesus is the perfect man who fulfils the purpose for which the world was made and the human race was brought into being, because He was the sinless man. God's world of order and beauty, which at the beginning He made in order to express in it His own nature, to make it the image of His own infinite perfection, comes to bloom and fruitage in the career of Jesus because in Him was no moral defect. He fulfilled the world because he fulfilled the law of the world. He brought to light the meaning of the world and disclosed its secret by being in harmony with its intent and purpose. The sinless man is the actualization of the divine and ideal world.

Jesus was the sinless man because He was the obedient man. His sinlessness was no mere cosmic product, no mere mechanical perfection, but the issue of freedom, the outcome of the loyal acceptance of obligation. It was as the personal will of God that Jesus saw and accepted the law of life. The Gospels are filled with the reiterated expressions of Jesus' devotion to the Father's will. These expressions, repeated at every turn, culminate in the utterance of the intercessory prayer: "I glorified thee on the earth, having accomplished the work which thou hast given me to do" (John 17:4). This sentence is noteworthy

in more ways than one, but this much at least and primarily it involves, that Jesus was given a work, that He consciously accepted it as a task, and that He loyally carried it through to the end. The whole story, as the Gospels tell it and as the more developed doctrinal portions of the New Testament recall and apply it, involves the truth that all that Jesus was, as exhibited in what He said and did, flowed forth from the central fountain of devotion to God and was the unflinching expression of His loyalty as human son.

Moreover, according to the same testimony, Jesus was the obedient man because He was the holy man. His consciousness from beginning to end was that of unity and harmony with God. He was in conscious and unbroken fellowship with God from childhood to maturity and through every phase of His career. He lived in the beatific vision and worked in the power of it. To Him, the skies were open and God was ever present. He was never alone—until the mysterious and awful hour of His doom His vision of God was never clouded and He walked in the light of Heaven. And, strangely enough, in view of His assertions of unity with God, the center of that consciousness of fellowship rested upon a basis of trust. His work was the work of God in Him. What He did, He did by divine permission and gift. He was begotten of God, which means that the very human nature He wore was inwrought through divine creative energy. He was called of God and ordained by the baptism of the Spirit to His mission. His was the Spirit-led, Spirit-filled, Spirit-fed life. Jesus was the ideal, the sinless, the obedient, holy man, because He was the trustful man. The Father's acknowledgment: "Thou art my Son," was accompanied by the filial acknowledgment:

"The Son can do nothing of himself." Jesus was what He was by virtue of His unbroken filial consciousness, issuing from His unbroken filial dependence. Out of His trustful Sonship, cherished amid all vicissitudes of life, issued, as the river comes from the overflowing spring, His blameless life of service and power.

The story of Jesus, therefore, from this point of view is the consummate literary expression of the conception which is the essential moral core of all religion, that the true life of man is in God. The ideal (who is the only real) man is the man whose life is established in fellowship with God. The perfection of character and life in Jesus was the natural result of this complete and holy union with the Father. What He attained is the divine purpose and intent of God for all mankind. To this end He created the world and to this same end has patiently worked through all the ages of human history.

But this is only the beginning of the wonderful cycle of ideas which center in Jesus. We have in the career of Jesus Himself, whose life is the realization of the ideal human life in God, an exhibition of the fact that humanity needed to be reconciled to God. The conflicts and the victory of the Son of Man show how deep the breach between the ideal world and the actual. It was only through the blood of His cross that peace could be made. Jesus was the perfect man but not without cost. The ideal manhood did not flow forth from the deep fountain of Christ's devotion to God in a smooth and unopposed current, along placid ways "where it is always afternoon." What is the meaning of the note of stress in the career of Jesus—of conflict, of trial—which issues in a hard-won victory? That this element appears in the life of Jesus and is

looked upon by the New Testament writers as a central element in its meaning there can be no possible question. His public career is ushered in by a crisis of temptation, and the entire meaning of this life is repeatedly made to turn upon the victory thus achieved.¹ In Hebrews there is a most touching reference to the fact that whatever Jesus achieved was through suffering and trial. Jesus, "because of the suffering of death," was "crowned with glory and honor." This is an echo of Paul's "wherefore" in Philippians 2:9. Without controversy the New Testament is full of this idea.

Whatever this may mean, in its widest application, it must first be regarded from the point of view of Jesus Himself. Undoubtedly, the ultimate issue of His life is something which He accomplished for others; but the vicarious accomplishment must have been the extension and overflow of what was primarily an individual and personal achievement. The salvation of men was the purpose of Jesus' life, but He actually had to live in order to fulfil that purpose. He was tempted, tried, and tested. He struggled and conquered. He qualified through a personally achieved victory for the headship of the redeemed race. What is the meaning of all this? Is the meaning difficult to read? Jesus lived in humanity. He shared the nature which in us is the seat and occasion of sin. He was absolutely sinless in that nature, but only at the cost of self-conquest over the weakness of the flesh. Can we doubt that the career of Jesus as the perfect man was not merely the realization, or fulfilment,

¹The fact that John omits the narratives of the temptation and the agony in the garden only serves to bring out more clearly the unique emphasis he places upon our Lord's mental struggles in the last phase of His ministry. (See John 12:23-28.)

but the reconstruction of the nature that He bore in becoming a brother to us? Deeply seated in that nature was the immemorial and unbroken tradition of sin. In order to the attainment of the perfect human character He must make conquest of human nature. He must die in that nature to the sin latent in it in order that we might have a new life in Him. (See Rom. 6:10.)

The moral victory of Jesus was typically and vitally the resurgence of humanity. He accomplished the reunion of the human nature which He wore with God by sacrificing Himself in it for us and subduing every natural human impulse to the Father's will—in sacrifice *even unto death*. In His death in this vital and personal way we were reconciled to God.

Nor is this all. Jesus came into our world, not merely to reveal the ideal world of divine thought and purpose, but also to win men to participate in it. He was not merely artist, poet, interpreter; He was prophet and deliverer. His idealism was militant, aggressive, missionary. Jesus was not philosopher, content to explain; He was also preacher, eager to win.

And it is necessary to get rightly the gist of His proclamation. It was emphatically and consistently a message of recall to God. The first utterance of Jesus was a deep-toned and authoritative echo of the message of John the Baptist: "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand" (Matt. 4:17). From that point on He proclaimed the "gospel of the kingdom" which is the "Gospel of reconciliation." The most striking (because the most unexpected, and for the most part unsuspected) evidence of the fact that the word of Jesus, from the beginning, was a Gospel of reconciliation, of recovery to God as the condition

of blessedness and power, is to be found in the Sermon on the Mount. Contrary to the common idea of it, the Sermon on the Mount is not an *ethical manifesto*, a moral charter for the new Kingdom. It is theological throughout, intended and framed to bring men into a new relationship with God. It is the Kingdom of God which He preaches, and we must return to God in repentance before we can become members of the Kingdom. He begins with the series of remarks or aphorisms concerning blessedness, which we call the Beatitudes. What is the condition of blessedness in the Kingdom of God? We find the condition in the words which immediately follow the series, ending with this expression: "Let your light so shine before men; that they may see your good works, and glorify your Father who is in heaven" (Matt. 5:16; cf. 5:48; 6:4, 6, 8, 15, 18, 26, 32; 7:21). How can we glorify our Father who is in Heaven? Because the qualities and graces which the disciples show forth are His.

Therefore, the gist of the lesson is, not that there is blessedness in the mere possession of the qualities of meekness, purity of heart, etc., but in possessing and exhibiting the life of God. This is the keynote and undertone of the entire sermon. It is the relationship of men to the Heavenly Father which is the urgent and appealing note of this great message. To win men to God is to win them to blessedness, to true charity, to prayer, to sane and simple and dignified views of life, to faith, to gentleness and discrimination in judgment, to the choice of satisfying and permanent realities in their ambitions and activities. To win men to God is to win them to the good, the beautiful, and the true. This is the "secret of Jesus"—which indeed is no longer a secret, for He plainly told it. It was

this purpose of universal recovery which animated and controlled all that He said and did. And the final implication of everything that He said was, that His own Sonship was the expression of humanity's true relationship to God. He not only constantly implies, but also explicitly states (as, for example, in the parables of the Lost Sheep, the Lost Coin, and the Lost Son) that God, who is eagerly waiting to be gracious, still values men, though they are sundered from Him and are lost, and that the way back to Him is open. These words on the lips of Jesus are peculiarly winsome because so consonant with the whole tone and temper of His life. He was always the Reconciler; on the one hand, always trying to commend God to men, as tender, patient, placable; on the other, trying to win men to God as sons. What could be more startling, for example, to our rigid and somewhat narrow notions of propriety than to say that God "maketh his sun to rise on the evil and the good, and sendeth rain on the just and the unjust" (Matt. 5:45)? But what could be more natural for one whose mission was conciliatory? What could be more seemingly absurd than to tell men that they shall be perfect like God (Matt. 5:48), but what more natural if He really believed that in reunion with God men might share His nature and become like Him? It was the task of Jesus to remove all misapprehension as to the attitude of God toward His human children, and to win them to a new filial relationship to Him. Into this single channel Jesus poured all the treasures of His devotion. Into this message went all the intensity of His zeal, all the power of His holy living, all the winsome earnestness of His gracious character. His closeness to God, His insight into the divine character,

His wonder-working power, His discernment of human motives, His spiritual authority, His penetrating and persuasive speech—all were directed upon the task of winning men to God. "Never man spake like this man," for never had man such things to say.

But the mission of Jesus was not to be fulfilled either in His life or in His message. The tragic need of the world could only be met by a tragic deliverance. Whatever more it may mean, the death of Jesus certainly means that human sin and alienation from God had gone too far to be overcome by a supremely gracious example of holy living, or by a message of love and reconciliation, though voiced by One incomparable in His knowledge of truth and in His ability to express it. We have seen that at the very beginning the ministry of Jesus gives evidence of a conscious purpose on His part to restore the world to a new life in God. It is not very long before evidence is given that He is conscious of the sorrowful fact that His mission cannot be accomplished except at the cost of His life. He is to be, not merely the Reconciler, but also the Reconciliation. "The Son of man also came not to be ministered unto, but to minister, and to give his life a ransom for many" (Mark 10:45). The shadow of the cross comes to rest upon His pathway very early, and that shadow deepens rapidly to the final tragic scene. The general New Testament interpretation of this event is another evidence of the profound and awakened religious consciousness behind these records. Here then is the theory, spread at large upon these wonderful pages.

The death of Jesus was the result of His rejection at the hands of those to whom His message of reconciliation was addressed. They rejected Him because

they were blinded and hardened by sin, which made it impossible for them to respond to the message of God or to receive the Messenger. They refused to be reconciled. The death which Jesus accepted by anticipation, not as a *fate* which could not be avoided, but as a *work* to be undertaken and finished, was to achieve the reconciliation which His preaching of the Gospel had failed to accomplish, in two ways.

First, it was to reveal sin and to judge it. It was to reveal sin as it is in itself, and in its results toward God. In rejecting Jesus men were rejecting God. In putting Jesus to death they were placing a seal of finality upon that rejection. In the light of the cross they were to see their sin in all its blackness. They had poured out innocent blood. They had lifted up their hand against the Lord's anointed, and brought to shame and disappointment their own sacred national hope. They were to stand self-convicted in the presence of the condemning act which their own hands had accomplished. They were fixed in conspicuous shame forever on the cross which they had caused to be raised.

But second, in the gracious purpose of God, the cross was to be the tragic instrument of deliverance by being made the instrument of repentance. God was pleased, in His reconciling grace, to bring men under *judicial condemnation* in order that they might be brought into a new life of holiness and hope. These intimations the disciples gathered from utterances from the lips of Jesus Himself, who anticipated His death and faced it with unfaltering resolution, but always refused to look upon it as a finality. "When ye have lifted up the Son of man, then shall ye know that I am he, and that I do nothing of myself, but as the

Father taught me, I speak these things." As an instrument of judgment, condemnation, and deliverance the cross became transformed from an instrument of shame, punishment, and degradation into the holy symbol of penitence, faith, and undying hope. In the light of the cross and the Resurrection, followed by its sequent events, repeatedly predicted but not really apprehended, the disciples gained an insight into much that had hitherto been concealed from them. These tragic and glorious events, rapidly succeeding each other, opened the way for higher, broader, deeper views of all that they had experienced in sharing the self-disclosure and ministry of Jesus. The very skies seemed to become transparent, and the secret councils of Heaven were opened to them. Almost at once their uncertain glimpses of Jesus as belonging to the eternal order, transient flashes of light which in passing leave the darkness deeper than before, moved forward to a thoroughly intelligible and established conviction of His heavenly origin and destiny which did not obscure but brought into fullest light and glory the meaning of His earthly life. In that discipleship, by daylight on the way from town to town, at night pillowed beneath the stars, they came to recognize that they had had fellowship with the Lord of Glory.

The life, which they had thus intimately known, belonged to the ages, and belonged now to them in an eternal fellowship, because it was before time began and was to endure when the stars had grown pale. The life they had known was not a mere bubble floating on the stream of time, soon to vanish away, but the living utterance of the very eternal significance of time itself. In that life they now clearly realized what they had always dimly felt, the throbbing of

infinite love and the steadfast movement of an eternal purpose. The very Son of God, the eternal, personal Word of Jehovah, had become flesh and tented among them, and they had beheld His glory. The life of Christ, therefore, both as revelation and as sacrifice, is taken to be the activity in time of God Himself. All that Jesus was in Himself, and all that He said and did, was predicated of God. As revelation, the Logos; as servant, the Son; as sacrifice, the Lamb of God. The total significance of Jesus may be expressed thus: The Revealer of the divine ideal in the perfect life establishes that ideal through reconciliation accomplished by sacrifice. As Harnack says: "The paradox of Christianity is that the Creator is also the Redeemer." The cosmic process is also redemptive. Creation and the sacrifice on the cross are steps in one consistent and progressive unveiling of God. The passion of God, which is the militant expression of His love, ideally made known in the prophets, becomes historical and actual in the life of Jesus. The preacher, the seeker, the winner of men is God Himself. The same Lord who is the Shepherd of Israel is also the Shepherd of those who do not belong to that fold. He goes forth to seek, at whatever cost, those who are His own. "Other sheep I have, which are not of this fold: them also I must bring * * * and they shall become one flock, one shepherd." This is the voice, not merely of a brother man, but of God Himself, who became our brother in order to win us to God.

The place and importance of the doctrine of the Incarnation, in the historic unfolding of the thought of God, are not far to seek nor difficult to interpret. It is the fulfilment of the desire of nations the world over and the ages through. It is moreover the logical

development of the Old Testament conception of God. The Old Testament is unfinished. It is magnificent expectation, but an expectation standing alone is necessarily a fragment. It demands historical fulfilment, a concrete embodiment, a true divine incarnation, in order to round it out to completeness. In their interpretation of God, not merely as eternal wisdom and power, but as militant and agonizing love, the prophets gave tremendous hostages to the future.

A theism of pure reason, which gives only the Supreme Cause, makes comparatively few moral demands upon history. A theism grounded in the conception of active and redeeming love makes an immense demand for moral results. The philosophic thought of the Greeks consciously reached the limit of speculation when they had clearly apprehended the need of the human heart for a full historic revelation of God to men. They never reached the point of realization, but they did give most explicit utterance to the sense of need. The wisest of them all, in outlining his thought concerning the immortal life, urges upon his followers the necessity of embarking upon this speculative hope as upon a raft—the best they could do until one of the gods should come to earth and show them the way. At the very time when the Greek philosophers were thus stating their sense of need, and longing for a special and fuller revelation, the Hebrew prophets were flinging wide open the gateway of the future, with the insistent proclamation that God would surely come. In so doing they (as we have said) mortgaged the future. After having so positively and affirmatively spoken, “history must come around to the side of faith” in order to save them from disappointment and discredit. A prophecy is a frag-

ment until it is joined to its complement in historic fulfilment. A prophetic fragment, denied permanently its complementary fact, would be a sad and final commentary on the vanity of human wishes, for it would stamp with futility our noblest hopes.

The writers of the New Testament, one and all, declare that in the career of Jesus they are presenting the historical complement to the prophetic expectation. It is not necessary to support at any length this statement by citations or by arguments. This conviction is written on every page of the New Testament. It is the essential and factual basis of the entire Gospel proclamation. "The beginning of the gospel of Jesus Christ, the Son of God. Even as it is written in Isaiah the prophet" (Mark 1:1, 2). "The testimony of Jesus is the spirit of prophecy." (See Rev. 19:10.) What we need to point out here is, that the higher view of the Person of Christ involved in the doctrine of the Incarnation is a necessary part of the idea that He fulfils the Old Testament expectation.

All that could be said concerning the love of God through inspired men had been said and well said through the prophets. From that point of view the Old Testament is no fragment, but is nobly complete. When the prophet says: "I have loved thee with an everlasting love: therefore with loving kindness have I drawn thee," he has given worthy voice and expression to the divine love, sufficient (as a voice and verbal expression) for all time. Jehovah's love for Israel and for all mankind finds suitable and noble utterance again and again in the Old Testament. But love is the one thing in the world that cannot remain a matter of verbal expression, however noble and appropriate. Love in words is love in shadow and reflection. Love

can be expressed only in action, and is measured and made concrete in sacrifice. Now we are far from saying that God's love to Israel is not manifested historically, for it is. But there is a significant difference in this respect between the Old Testament and the New. In the old history God is lovingly, transcendently, in sovereign and administrative power, directing movements for the good of His people and exercising His good will on their behalf. These utterances of love are therefore spiritual, not historical; mediated through the inspired consciousness of the prophets, not in actions. They are messages of pleading which disclose the heart as fully as tender and beseeching *words* of evident sincerity ever may. In the New Testament the divine love in Christ is disclosed through actions performed in person, through suffering which He Himself endures. In this fact, that the career of Jesus brings God among men to suffer with them as He seeks for them, the New Testament is the fulfilment of the Old. In this fact, also the higher Christology is necessarily involved. Otherwise, the New Testament contains nothing new, nothing essentially different from what has already been experienced under the old dispensation. The whole Bible is thus made into a fragment, for the expectation of God which it awakens is not fulfilled.

The New Testament is not a postscript to the Old Testament, but a fulfilment of it. It is not a letter nor a verbal message in any sense. The message is the Messenger. The conviction that in Jesus Christ the disciples met and dealt with God is the very nerve of the Gospel proclamation. This conviction it was (that Jesus was "Immanuel"—God with us) that gave unexampled power to the preaching of the early Chris-

tians. This conviction was, that in Christ they had been brought to God and established in a new relationship with Him, not in the sense that Christ had taught new truth after the manner of a prophet, but that in His own person and by His own redeeming work He had opened up a new and living way to God. This was but the normal response of actual experience to His own words: "I am the way, and the truth, and the life." That this belief in the deeper truth of the Incarnation was the dynamic of the early Gospel can scarcely be denied. As Professor Denney has expressed it: "At bottom, the Gospel is not good advice, but good news" (Expositors Bible, 2 Corinthians, p. 214).

Moreover, it was this interpretation of Christ on a cosmic scale, as Lord and Creator as well as Redeemer, which has given Christianity its historic place and its permanent power.

It is not only, as Principal Fairbairn has pointed out with complete success, that the interpretation of Christ in terms of Deity and Incarnation made the Christian religion as an interpretation of the world process, a philosophic exposition of the meaning of life; it is the only interpretation which makes possible a faith in the goodness of God, which is deeply enough based and sufficiently stable to stand in the midst of human sin and sorrow. It reveals God as one with us in those experiences which are hardest to understand or endure. In view of this teaching we can say:

O Love divine, that stooped to share
Our sharpest pang, our bitterest tear.

"Then we can look up to a God who is not impassible, as the speculations of men have falsely represented

Him, but passible; and therefore full of infinite capacity of pure sorrow and saving sympathy. Then the dumb and sullen resentment which rises in noble minds at the thought of a universe in which there is so much helpless pain and hopeless grief, created by an immovable Being who has never felt nor ever can feel either pain or grief—that sense of moral repulsion from the idea of an unsuffering and unsympathetic Creator, which is and always has been the deepest, darkest spring of doubt—fades away; and we behold a God who became human in order that He might bear, though innocent and undeserving, all our pains and all our griefs” (Van Dyke, *Gospel for an Age of Doubt*, p. 163).

It now remains for us to review and summarize briefly the significance of this discussion. What is the significance of the New Testament testimony from the purely psychological point of view? Taken, not as fact, but as doctrine, what does the New Testament mean? As an expression of the religious consciousness of the Christian church its testimony is direct and unimpeachable. Taken as such and nothing more, it means that the Christian consciousness has created the figure of the redeeming Christ, endowed without the aid of objective fact, with all the qualities which make His portrait so unique in human annals, so powerful in human life. It means that a group of men, by the aid of the imagination alone, working on elements gathered from the Old Testament and floating contemporary ideas, fashioned out of their own inner consciousness the Messianic King, who is also the world's Saviour, the Lord of Glory, who is also the friend and helper of men; God in the flesh, a human character, revealing and embodying, not merely the

thoughts and ideas of God, but God's own self. They supplied words fitting to His lips and works adequate to His hand, a spirit for His task and a task worthy of His Spirit.

All this implies, first of all, an overwhelming sense of God as operating in contemporary or nearly contemporary history. This sense of the nearness of God was so intense that it overcame their natural conservatism and all their inherited prejudices with regard to physical representations of Deity, and blazed forth in an historical and personal narrative, having for its theme the appearance of God in human form among men. They interpreted the story of God in the fashion of One who suffered and died and was buried. They interpreted the holiness of God in terms of an altar on which the Holy One Himself was offered up. They interpreted the love of God in terms of a divine sacrifice and a self-giving in the form of a shameful death endured for others. All that we are now contending for is that the sense of God as an active participant in human affairs was so overwhelming as absolutely to submerge their consciousness of actual reality and their sense of the distinction between vision and fact, so as to introduce an artificial and imaginary history in place of the actual. The subjective mind, beyond question, has great powers of self-illusion, but nothing parallel to this has ever been seen elsewhere. For this obsessed Christian imagination has incorporated into a narrative so extended, so detailed, so vividly lifelike, so inwrought with historical, geographical, and social matters of fact, as to defy the keenest intelligence to discover, except by *a priori* determination, the dividing line of fact and fancy. No purely historical criticism has ever shown this essential dividing line; that some

If the narrative is fact is beyond doubt; that all of it may be is at least possible. As testimony to the consciousness of God on the part of a group of men it is impressive beyond words. On this basis, apart from all questions of historic fact, major or minor, the New Testament stands as the highest literary and imaginative expression of the religious consciousness. It is an epic of Divine Providence and human redemption of unexampled consistency, splendor, and power. Compared with it the *Iliad*, the *Æneid*, the book of *Job*, *Prometheus Bound*, *Paradise Lost*, the *Divina Commedia* are as child's play.

But there is another aspect of the psychological fact which merits notice. It evinces a profound and acute consciousness of a need of deliverance from sin and restoration to God on the part of the human race. Two living and active principles confront each other in the New Testament, and the entire book is given up to the interaction between the two. These two principles are the holiness of God as realized in Jesus Christ and the principle of sin as operating in the world of human beings to whom Jesus was sent. In the absence of historical fact we are shut up to the supposition that the early Christians conceived of human sin as expressing its inner nature and bearing its bitter fruit in the rejection and murder of the Holy One. It is to be remembered that from the point of view of the writers themselves, the crucifixion of Jesus was not the martyrdom of a prophet, but the gibbeting of the very Son of God. "But ye denied the Holy and Righteous One, and asked for a murderer to be granted unto you, and killed the Prince of life" (*Acts 3:14, 15*). This is the frightful indictment which the New Testament writers frame against their age. This

is their interpretation of the sinfulness of the world. This is their measure of the need of deliverance and restoration to God. This hypothesis implies that these writers so conceived the malignancy and virulence of sin that they wrote it out in a tragedy, so vividly realized that they believed in it as fact, and projected themselves as eye-witnesses and actors into the imaginary scenes which they depict. Sin brought about, among the chosen people of God, the rejections, the unjust condemnation, the unholy murder of their Heavenly Lord and longed-for King.

Here the outstanding fact is that the consciousness of the universality and power of sin in the world was so intense that it overwhelmed their sense of objective reality, and embodied itself in an imaginary history which quite took the place of the ordinary events which were really happening. Again we are impressed with the magnitude of the achievement. In the construction and dramatic unity which pervades it, in the intense and poignant reality which breathes in every utterance and clothes every act, in the heartbreaking realism of its ultimate outcome, this little book, as a tragedy, as a work of creative imagination, is without a rival in literature. It is the very consciousness of a sinful world, despairing of self-help, brought to supreme and final utterance.

There is one other phase of this psychological fact which remains. The New Testament is a book of salvation, not potential in an incomplete process of effort and tragic failure, but in actual and victorious realization. The New Testament contains, not only the story of Christ, but that of Christians in Christ. It is the testimony of those who have consciously come into a permanent union with Christ, and through Christ

have come into a new fellowship with God. "But now in Christ Jesus ye that once were far off are made nigh in the blood of Christ" (Eph. 2:13). "We also rejoice in God through our Lord Jesus Christ, through whom we have now received the reconciliation" (Rom. 5:11). Here again we are impressed with the depth and intensity of the subjective persuasion. An entire generation of men are possessed, or rather *obsessed*, with the idea that they have come into a new life through the operation and divine use of the tragedy of the cross, and have imagined that they are now consciously in possession of a peace which lifted the burden away from sin-weighted consciences, and opened before them the joy of an endless life in God. All this is a conscious, present experience. It is worth while to point out that at this point the psychological fact begins to verge toward the historical and to approach the region of positive verification.

But before we are allowed to follow this alluring suggestion there is an aspect of Christianity, looked upon as a psychological fact, or group of facts, which demands more careful consideration than we have yet given it in its relationship to the Old Testament which lies behind it. These two libraries, widely separated as they are in time, in manner of composition, in intellectual climate, are yet the outcome of one movement, and are therefore organically related to each other, having a common psychological basis. Psychologically Christianity is greater in sweep than the New Testament—it compasses the Bible in both its parts. We are interested for this phase of the discussion also in the venerable body of documents comprising the Old Testament, not as the record of a supposed divine revelation, nor even as the narrative of actual historical

events, but solely as literary documents embodying the historical consciousness of a great people. We may perhaps safely assume common consent to the assertion that the Hebrew people existed and that in some way among them they produced the Old Testament. This assumption is entirely sufficient for the purpose we have now in mind. Apart from all questions of inspiration or historicity, the Old Testament is a wonderfully valuable and significant group of human documents. We wish to treat them as such and set forth the psychological testimony which they contain. Their value from this point of view is notable. The Hebrew people were endowed with a clear and profound religious consciousness. That consciousness finds literary expression in the Old Testament. While it is true that the Old Testament has many points of contact with other sacred writings, and that many of its organic principles are the common property of the universal religious consciousness, it is also strikingly true that it departs from other writings and stands in a class by itself as regards the clearness, the organic unity, and the systematic consistency with which its ideas are laid down and carried forward. It gives full, articulate, and consistent expression to ideas which, though found elsewhere, are elsewhere confused, more or less incoherent, and overlaid with error. In a very real and practical sense the Old Testament is a textbook in religious psychology, and it is all the more significant and valuable in that it is evidently a part of a life and movement much broader than that of any one people. It is unique but also typical.

The first thing that strikes one who reads the Old Testament discerningly with a view to its ruling ideas is the ideality of its world-view. While this

world-view is in form ancient and Oriental, and, in the beginning at least, primitive and pictorial, it is free from the intellectual and moral blemishes which are so marked in all contemporary documents. If the Hebrews believed that the earth was the center of the universe, that the sun, moon, and stars were created for the purpose of lighting the earth, that heaven was an opaque dome superimposed upon the earth, all the more marvelous is it that, accepting such a primitive view of things, they were able to transfuse into it so lofty and so essentially a modern conception of the world as the expression of cosmic law and eternal reason.

The Hebrew writers were not scientists. They spoke in the language of appearance and in terms that the ordinary man could understand. And yet it is no more than fair to say that their attitude and spirit were essentially scientific. In every fundamental aspect the world of the Hebrew was a world of solid fact and cosmic order in which things happen in accordance with general principles. It was not a haphazard world or fairyland, in which anything might happen at any time and in any order, such as we find depicted in the Egyptian and Babylonian records. The monsters of the deep, the dragon, leviathan, lilith,² satyr, and the like appear in the Hebrew literature as mere poetical references, crystallized mythology or mere choice literary embellishment in descriptions of a world made stable, orderly, and intelligible by the wisdom and might of the one true and living God.

The Hebrew was not a philosopher in the technical sense. His mind was practical rather than speculative.

²See article, Night Monster, International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, p. 2143.

But it is intensely interesting to note how he finds his way over the precipices and perils of speculation, like a sure-footed mountaineer on his native crags. He is completely governed in all his thinking by certain organic ideas which save him from narrowness and from the pitfalls of pettiness and inconsistency into which the practical man is so often betrayed.

The Hebrew thinker emerges from the mystery of his prehistoric schooling the possessor of a world-view so noble, so spiritual, and so conservative of all the sacred interests of life and yet so practically adaptable that it comes over into our modern world and makes for itself a place even there. The fact of the matter is that the Old Testament is constitutionally in harmony with progressive human thought because it so consistently deals with essential and unchangeable principles and relationships. It delineates a world created and controlled by God. It describes a visible world based upon eternal principles of truth and law, shot through with glories from within the unseen, touched with the light that never was on land or sea.

The Old Testament places man in this world of order and beauty as its crown and head. In his original creation and in his organic constitution he is akin to God. He belongs to God, for he is created in the divine image and is endowed with a deputed divine sovereignty over the earth and the creatures in it. He has the capacity to know God and to enter into fellowship with Him. This is by no means to be confused with the common ethnic notion that man is the offspring of the gods and thus, by a natural tie which degrades Deity but does not elevate man, made akin to Him. It is an ethical conception throughout. It completely guards the transcendence and majesty

of God, first, by affirming that only as a spiritual being and in the highest exercise of his powers is he in the divine image; and, second, by the accompanying assertion that in himself and apart from God he is nothing. "What is man, that thou art mindful of him? or the son of man, that thou visitest him? For thou hast made him but little lower than God, and crownest him with glory and honor." "There is a spirit in man and the inbreathing of an Almighty One makes him to understand." "All flesh is grass, and all the goodliness thereof is as the flower of the field. The grass withereth, the flower fadeth, because the breath of Jehovah bloweth upon it; surely the people is grass." But the striking thing after all is, that with such a lofty conception of God and with such an ideality controlling its view of the world as made by God, the Hebrew should place man so near to God and make him a citizen in that ideal world. Man is unique. The world and everything were made—man alone was inbreathed, a conscious, personal sharer in the life of God.

All that has thus far been said about man refers to the Old Testament conception of him, ideally speaking. Quite different is its account of man as he actually is. Ideally man is bound up in the same bundle of life with God, the representative and vicergerent of God upon earth, His servant and His son. It is strange that with this conception of the fellowship of God and man, the Old Testament should so uncompromisingly depict man's actual character and career in the world. It would have been so fatally easy to attempt an idealized character retouched with a hand so skilful as to obliterate every ugly line. Its conception of the ideal man as God framed him and

intended him to be is expressed in the story of the creation and the garden. Its conception of the actual man, as his history shows him to be, is written on every page of the narrative in which human wilfulness, perversity, and degradation are told at length. The Biblical writers dipped their pens in candor and wrote down the damning record as it actually was. Naught was extenuated, even in the case of saints or heroes; naught was set down in malice.

Now between the ideal and the actual man, between the man of God's intent and the man who has drenched the earth with blood and covered history with shame, there lies, according to the Old Testament, a spiritual catastrophe. In the ideal and actual man we have the same man but dreadfully changed. This is, of course, the familiar story of the fall. Be it remembered that the critical question as to where or by whom the story was originated is not now at issue. Neither is the historicity of Adam or Eve or their experience up for discussion. We are dealing simply and solely with the conception, the idea, the psychological fact. The mind of Israel developed this conception of a fall away from or out of a primeval and organic union with God as the expression of its deepest consciousness of spiritual reality. One may call the Adam and Eve story a myth, if he chooses, but that does not finally dispose of it. The question remains: Is the fact which the myth attempts to explain true? Does the myth faithfully represent the fact? A myth is a doctrine in story form; is the doctrine true? Several features of it are to be carefully noted here.

The story, so far as we know, is original with Israel. No parallel to it has yet been found. The story represents also, and expresses in an intensely

vivid and original way, the deep ethical earnestness of the Hebrew thinkers. It is often misinterpreted. It is not an attempt speculatively to account for the origin of moral or natural evil. Neither is it a theoretical explanation of the presence of death in the world. It is rather a concrete presentation, to the heart and conscience of man, of himself as he is in God's thought of him and as he has become through neglect of God and the misuse of freedom. The doctrine of the fall is a religious conception throughout. It accounts for moral wrongdoing as being the consequence of religious misplacement. Out of fellowship with God man is morally fallen. By this interpretation religion and morality are inseparably united. By this simple and yet wonderful conception religion is moralized and morals personalized and both united in one harmonious conception of life. More than this, the idea of the fall guards in the most effective way the sacred interests of the moral life. Moral evil is either congenital or catastrophic. If it is congenital then it is not, strictly speaking, evil at all. It is a congruent and normal element in the life of the race, a phase of evolution, a stadium of advance along the ascending pathway of development. If this is all that the term moral evil really means then it is quite clear that altogether too much stress has been laid upon it. A truly urgent moral conception of life cannot survive the application of a morality like this. The truth that man *is* what he ought not to be, in any other or more earnest sense than the vague notion of immaturity, is incompatible with any other theory than that he has *become* what he ought not to be.

"This is the fact of the Fall, a fact, the truth of which it would seem wholly unnecessary to discuss,

because what Christianity means by it is simply what it is impossible for any man to deny. Neither sin nor death is any part of the proper definition and meaning, or of the true law, of manhood. They are the denial, contradiction, and destruction of it. Yet both sin and death are a universal and inevitable part of man's actual and natural condition. Whether or not a man Adam fell, unquestionably man has, because he is fallen. He is in a condition which is manifestly a fall, and a deep fall, from his proper law and end; and he can be raised up to and made to attain his perfection and distinction only through what is for him a Salvation" (Du Bose, *Soteriology of the New Testament*, p. 39).

Still further the idea of the fall furnishes the basis for the hope of redemption. According to this conception, man is not evil through depravation, so to speak, through the lesion of his moral tissue, but functionally, through the loss of harmony with his true spiritual environment which is God. Recovery to God means, therefore, moral renewal. Re-established spiritual relationship means re-established harmony of moral function. To make man righteous you must first make him holy. Since God is ever living and ever willing to give Himself, holiness, which is God working in the human spirit, is possible, and consequently righteousness for man is also possible. Reconciliation would necessarily be salvation.

This brings us to the third great idea of the Old Testament, that God is actually engaged in an attempt to win man back to Himself. It is well worth our while to pause for a moment and contemplate the background of this suggestion. The universe at large is one vast interacting harmony with God as its living

center. According to the Hebrew thinker, the will of God is the inner harmony, the connective principle, of all things. Man, according to the original intent of his creation and according to his natural constitution, should be a conscious, free, and willing participant in these cosmic harmonies. But instead of fulfilling his normal end as the crown of the natural world, man is the one exception. His life is the one element of discord in a world of law. He is the violator of his own acknowledged law. Now, in spite of this defection, God is represented in the Old Testament as still placing a value upon him, as seeking him in his wandering, and as attempting to re-establish him in the harmony of the divine law and love. Yes, we venture these two words together. No doubt a touch of austerity belonging to the general Semitic conception of God is not lacking in the Old Testament, but wondrously does that austerity melt into tenderness when we view as a whole the divine attitude to man as the epic of Israel unfolds. From the day of his creation, through all the stages of the history until the last prophet flings his voice out toward the coming of the Christ, God is represented as the Seeker after man. In this history He is the divine and gracious aggressor. Men are called into His service and into the service of other men, in a race-wide movement of blessing and deliverance. In prophecy the voice of God is heard not merely in command and warning, but in pleading. God is not only angry at sin, but grieved by it. And in spite of obduracy and persistent wilfulness He remains gracious and patient.

The entire prophetic movement as disclosed in its literature culminates in a doctrine of redemption which,

in its formal aspect, is essentially one with the Gospel message of the New Testament. God is disclosed as the Seeker, the Healer, the Redeemer, the Father, of Israel. Jeremiah's prophetic lament over Ephraim (31-20) is practically the parable of the Prodigal Son. This passage just cited, which is notable both as literature and doctrine, is peculiarly pertinent here because it centers articulately in the conception of a divinely instituted reconciliation. This principle is not stated in formal or systematic terms, but it is stated in terms of life, of tender relationships, of grieving, yearning, and seeking, love. Ephraim is a silly, wilful, wayward child. Jehovah is a father who yearns with tenderness unutterable and irresistible even when his judgment dictates severity. To this noble-hearted prophet redemption is not a system or a scheme, but a vital process. He felt no more keenly perhaps than other prophets, but with tremendous emotional intensity, the seeking and reconciling love of God. Hosea's touching parable of the faithless wife, Isaiah's exquisite lyric of redemption when the "ransomed of Jehovah shall return, and come with singing unto Zion," both involve the same essential conception of Jehovah's activity and aggressiveness, of Jehovah as the Seeker and Saviour of man. And it is notable that while this attempt to deliver men from their lapsed condition centers in Israel, it continually sweeps beyond national boundaries and is seen to involve world-movements and even a racial process. The ordained servant of Jehovah is set forth to be a deliverer of the nations, who is to nurse into vigor feeble gropings after God wherever found in the world. (See Isa. 42:3, 4.) In this passage we find, as elsewhere in the Old Testament, the fundamental conception that recovery to

God will involve moral restoration. The servant who is sent forth in the power of the Spirit of God is to bring justice among the nations by recalling them to the worship and service of Jehovah.

We pause for reiterated emphasis on the fact already stressed, that according to the Old Testament moral degradation wherever found is the issue and result of religious lapse, and that the only way to lift men up morally is by re-establishing them in the fellowship of God. But these writers do not stop with this general idea, but go on to affirm what is a more daring conception, that God Himself is at work, urgently, tenderly, and persistently, to win men back to Himself. The recovery of the lapsed is primarily the divine task and is the primary divine task. The prophets and moralists of Israel, aflame with zeal for God and yearning over men with consuming passion to win them to God, felt that the zeal by which they were literally eaten up was but a faint and far-away reflection of the passion of Jehovah for the recovery of His own.*

This conception that men belong to God by a tie at once ideal and historic, that their moral and other disorders are due to the rending of this tie, and that God is seeking for reconciliation which is redemption for men, permeates the entire Old Testament and is logically involved in every Israelitish institution. Take, for example, the elaborate sacrificial system. We are not here concerned with any questions as to the origin or development of this system. In its entirety it represents the Hebrew consciousness of relationship with God and embodies a method of carrying out that relationship in affairs of religious worship. Nothing

*Cf. G. A. Smith, *Isaiah*, vol. ii, p. 141.

could be more direct or unmistakable as evidence of ruling ideas. This institutional and ritualistic scheme was looked upon as divinely instituted and authorized. No matter now whether it actually was or not, the Hebrews *thought* it was. As divinely instituted, it represented the thought of God toward them. To perform these ceremonies in the spirit in which they were enjoined was to please God and to enter into a state implying peace and happiness. As divinely instituted these ritualistic exercises expressed a divine willingness to maintain, in spite of their sin, a direct and personal relationship with the people in a service every feature of which implied communion. Whatever may be said about the primitive sacrifice, whether it may be considered merely as a sacramental meal involving the unqualified notion of communion with the Deity or as sacrifice involving the idea of expiation, there can be no possible question as to the significance of the Hebrew sacrificial system as a whole. It is expiatory and redemptional. It is a system of reconciliation. Whether you take the structural form of the tabernacle and the location and character of its furniture, the literary structure of the book of Leviticus or the mode of procedure in the conduct of any one of the more important sacrifices, all the facts point in the same direction. The sacrificial system presents really, though (to our minds) in less winsome guise, the same ideas which are to be found in history and prophecy, that access to Jehovah is obtainable only by an expiatory and confessional act which involves at once a confession of the divine holiness and of human sinfulness.

And in the background lies this organic idea that God though holy is gracious, forgiving, placable, and

Himself actively the seeker of man. Forgiveness and restoration are looked upon as absolutely and invariably necessary. No man can approach unto God without the touch of blood upon him. No man, except the High Priest, once a year, could enter the Holy of Holies, and he could enter only after confessing his own sins and those of the people. We are all quite familiar with these facts, but we have not always correctly apprehended them or at least emphasized them. We should do the sacrificial system of the Hebrews but scant historical justice by making acknowledgment of the greatness and nobility of the ideas embodied and expressed in it. Nothing could be more spiritual than these related ideas, of divine holiness, sin, confession, forgiveness, and restoration. These sacrifices, like any other symbolic and sacramental actions, might easily be misconstrued and misused. We ourselves are continually mistaking the sign for the thing signified. But the system itself expressed, in terms of universally accepted institutions of worship and sacrifice, the all-controlling spiritual ideas of the Hebrew teachers. What we often fail to see is that the ritual was the essential expression of the redemptive idea and was grounded in a deep consciousness of the divine love.

We have paid no extended notice thus far to the Messianic expectation of the Old Testament. And yet this Messianic cycle in some respects is the most characteristic and distinctive deliverance of the Hebrew religious consciousness. It is by no means exclusively predictive. On the contrary, it is primarily an interpretation of life, only secondarily predictive. Every prophetic utterance lays hold upon the immediate situation in which it is spoken. Each separate

prophetic oracle was a tract for its own times. But it also reaches out into the future because it enters so deeply into the present. Indeed, the distinctive feature of the Old Testament Messianic prophecy is that it deals with successive historical situations on the basis of principles so great and enduring that they are essentially timeless. As an interpretation of life, Messianic prophecy is one with the Christian Gospel, and both are for all time. There are features of this Messianic type of thought which we venture to say would be considered utterly incredible were it not set down in black and white. At the bottom of it lies the familiar notion of Israel as the chosen people of God. Along with this idea is one much less familiar to the ordinary Bible student, the idea of a mediatorial function and responsibility for the people of God. In the great covenant passage it is said: "Ye shall be unto me a kingdom of priests, and a holy nation" (Ex. 19:6). This same conception, that Israel is intended as a medium of revelation to the world, is found in other prophetic passages. (See Isa. 2:1-4, and others.) The whole personal and institutional life of Israel was keyed at this level of separation to God in an intimate and sacred covenant relationship, of dedication to God in a world-wide international mediation and priesthood.⁴

Evidently all these conceptions of national priesthood and mediation, of the Servant of Jehovah who is also Jehovah's Son, of a priesthood which is the expression in religious rite of Jehovah's service, of a kingship which is the political realization of Jehovah's service, of an order of ordained teachers whose teaching is the expression of Jehovah's service, are framed

⁴See Edersheim, *Life and Times of Jesus the Messiah*, vol. i, p. 161.

in terms of the ideal. In the conception of the Kingdom of God the ideal world of reason, order, law, and righteousness is brought down from Heaven and established on earth. Israel, as the people of God, was the chosen instrument for the realization of this purpose. The ideal world of the divine purpose is presented to Israel as a summons to national dedication and achievement. Thus Israel is to become mediator between God and the nations, in a reconciling and redemptive economy of Providence. The world was to be won to God through the agency of Israel.

The Messianic significance of this interpretation, in the New Testament sense, is brought about in two ways. In the first place, Jehovah is looked upon as the Redeemer of Israel in the original nation-forming covenant relationship. We should recall all the circumstances surrounding the giving of the covenant at Sinai which indicate that it was a reconciling ordinance, a restoration to forfeited favor, distinctively a matter of grace. The exodus from Egypt was a great deliverance and a most high God was their Deliverer. (See Ps. 78:35.) The touching words of the Levitical prayer in Deuteronomy 21:8, "Forgive, O Jehovah, thy people Israel, whom thou hast redeemed," expresses the religious consciousness of Israel. This conception, that the entire history from Abraham onward is redemptive and that Israel's fulfilment of her historic mission to the nations can be accomplished only as the work of one redeemed and in the power of an accomplished redemption, throws the prophetic mind toward the future when that redemption should be complete in Israel and among the nations.

But still more effective in bringing the expectation of a Messianic age of deliverance at the hands of a

great personal deliverer to the prophetic mind was the historic disclosure of the magnitude and difficulty of the task involved in the redemption of Israel. There may have been a time when hopeful thinkers might suppose that Israel had been redeemed and restored to fellowship with God once for all in the deliverance from Egypt and in the establishment of the covenant, but the history gave the lie to the hope. By the time the prayer quoted above was incorporated into the regular ritual of worship it was plain to all that the deliverance of Israel from sin and complete restoration to Jehovah was to be a costly and difficult task. This became increasingly clear to the prophets. Every element in the ideal constitution of Israel was contradicted by the fact. The ideal Messianic King, except, so to speak, figuratively in David at his best, failed to appear but was shamed by a line of kings who were little more than puppets. The ideal mediatorial priesthood was dishonorably represented by a formal and venal succession of time-serving and formalistic ritualists. Even prophecy failed not so much in the persons of its representatives, who were really men of God, as in the refusal of the people at large to listen to their messages.

Under this severe discipline of disappointment the prophets were enabled to read more deeply into human nature and human life in the light of the divine purpose until the fuller significance of the redemptive process opened before them. In a series or group of varied, vivid, and really majestic representations the Old Testament writers unfold their visions of the future. In certain of the Psalms (notably 2 and 110) is given the delineation of the Lord's Anointed who is set by divine decree on the Holy Hill of Zion, inter-

nally Israel's perfect ruler, externally victor over all opposition and vice-gerent of God upon the earth. This conception has echoed throughout the literature, notably in Micah (5:2). It is remarkable that this universal kingship is looked upon as the issue of prolonged and bitter conflict. In the first part of Isaiah appears the doctrine of the Remnant. According to this striking representation, while the historic Israel has been found unfaithful, yet there is an inner and spiritual core of Israelites consisting of those who are true to Jehovah, and by painful sifting this faithful remnant, even though very small, shall be saved in order to serve Jehovah's gracious purpose.

In the second part of Isaiah the remnant is narrowed down to one, in that matchless, serial epic of the Servant of Jehovah. When this perfect story is completely told the Servant of Jehovah stands out, not as the idealized Israel, but as the ideal Israelite who, despised and rejected of men, sprinkles many nations, after first healing the sins of Israel by having laid on Him the iniquity of all. He represents Israel and fulfils her historic mission to the world only as He is cut off from the land of the living—"for the transgression of my people to whom the stroke was due." Here Israel is the subject of redemption and is brought into harmony with God through the suffering of Him whom she despised and rejected.

Jeremiah draws for us the picture of the righteous branch of Israel, who is the true and ideal King, who is to save Judah and Israel. He is to "reign as king and deal wisely, and shall execute justice and righteousness in the land." Jeremiah also predicts the day of the new covenant with Israel when the law of God shall be written on the hearts of the redeemed people,

when sin shall be forgiven and iniquities shall be remembered no more.

Joel has a picture of a future day of spiritual illumination and outpouring upon all flesh, this, too, a wonderful deliverance at the hands of God. This prophecy of a day of outpouring of the Spirit frequently occurs in the utterances of the prophets.

Zechariah has one exquisite picture of the true King to come, approaching the walls of the Holy City, clothed not with the trappings of royalty, but in the garments of lowliness, bringing salvation as He rides on a mission of peace.

These illustrations might be greatly multiplied, but it is not necessary in order to gain a clear idea of their general import. One instance of great significance and beauty we may glance at as embodying the ruling ideas of these prophetic utterances. Nearly at the beginning of the book of Isaiah there are three oracles on Jerusalem—"the three Jerusalems," as Principal Smith calls them. In the first one (2:2-5) the prophet depicts the ideal Jerusalem, the center and rallying place of the world's religious life, whither the nations shall flow as a river seeks the sea. In the second (2:6—4:1) he depicts the actual Jerusalem as one would see it who walks the streets and observes its life. This portrayal is as uncompromisingly renunciatory as the former is enthusiastic and laudatory. In the third (4:2-6) the man of God speaks of the redeemed and purified Jerusalem, "when the Lord shall have washed away the filth of the daughters of Zion, and shall have purged the blood of Jerusalem from the midst thereof, by the spirit of justice, and by the spirit of burning." Here we meet in the clearest possible exposition the three great ruling ideas

of the Old Testament. The ideal Israel, the ideal Jerusalem, the ideal man, is *man* in harmony with God, head of God's creation, God's fellow in the working out of His holy will. There the actual man of sin, pride, failure, and wretchedness—the same man out of harmony with God. And as the center and soul and vitalizing principle of the entire conception, the God of grace, seeking man in order through reunion and restoration to save him unto the fulness of life.

We not only concede, but gladly and fervently proclaim, that the prophets were dealing with the needs and problems of their own days, but just because they saw so deeply into present-day life and interpreted human nature in terms of the actual and the possible, they reached out and touched the future; rather they reached *down* and laid hold upon the timeless principle underneath history, which we have found to be the essence of the old-new, new-old Gospel, the principle of the divine reconciliation in the Christ who was and is and is to be.

NEW YORK.

A BRIEF HISTORY OF HERESY

By PROFESSOR JOHN ALFRED FAULKNER, Drew Theological Seminary

THE word heresy is generally used of those doctrines in Christianity which have been formally condemned by a general council, or informally condemned by the substantial unanimity of the church as a whole. Thus the doctrine that Christ is not the eternal Son of God and therefore not essentially divine was condemned by the first general council, that of Nicaea, 325, and is a formal heresy. The doctrine that all persons will ultimately be saved has never been condemned in this way, and cannot be considered heretical in the technical sense; but it has been so universally rejected by nearly all churches through their recognized theologians and standards that it may be considered heretical no less really. To deny the doctrine that Christ died for our sins is heretical, because it was spoken by general councils, but to deny that death was a satisfaction to God's justice in the penal sense is not heretical in the same way. At the same time so ingrained in the consciousness of the church has been the belief that the atonement was a real objective satisfaction to God the Father as a God of love, righteousness, and holiness—so almost universally expressed by theologians, individual church confessions, etc., has this belief been—that its denial as by the so-called moral influence theory of atonement and the so-called governmental theory can fairly be considered no less really heretical.

It will thus be seen that the general use of the word heretical gives no guarantee as to the truth or falsity

of a doctrine. If it did, all we should have to ask is: Has the doctrine in question been affirmed by a general council, or almost universally believed by the church? Not only would no Protestant assent to that test, but no genuine truth lover of any church would do so. No Christian who has thought the matter through could for a moment put his faith on a majority of votes or on the silent majority of his fellow Christians. He would say: Truth alone holds me. If asked what was his external test of truth, he would say: The teachings of Christ and His inspired apostles, or the teachings of the Scriptures on fundamentals. But that does not mean that the teaching of councils is not true, much less that the general consent of Christians in all ages is not true, much less still that there can be any better working criterion of heresy than these two. To say, for instance, that the church in all ages has been mistaken in believing that Christ was essentially one with the Father, however different in various respects, would be to say that God had so little regard for His truth and His church that He allowed His people in all ages not only to be fundamentally mistaken on the most vital thing in Christianity, but to be so mistaken that the church in all ages has been guilty of idolatry. This would be to confess that the gates of hades had prevailed with a vengeance (Matt. 16:18). It would be to confess that there has been no Christian church from the beginning till now.

The reader will therefore see that while in theory he cannot tie his faith to anything less than Christ, the Word, and his own conscience, in practice he can safely assume that a substantially unanimous consent of the church in all ages from Pentecost till now affords a guide to truth so generally reliable that it

is at least the part of the objector to prove wherein that consent is a broken reed. Here is the kernel of truth in the doctrine of infallibility, which our Roman friends have so much exploited, and here is the justification in part for the feeling of revulsion which Christians have had against heresy, both against the name and the thing.

When we turn to the New Testament we come to another use of the word heresy, for of course it was too early for the assembly of universal councils, though not in later New Testament times for a canvass of universal consent. If we take Thayer's Grimm's Lexicon of the New Testament as sufficiently accurate for our purpose, we get the following result. Heresy is: (1) A chosen opinion, especially, according to the context, one varying from the truth (2 Pet. 2:1: False teachers bringing in destructive heresies, or, as the margin reads, sects of perdition, denying even the Master that bought them). (2) A body of men separating themselves from others, and following their own beliefs (Acts 5:17: The sect of the Sadducees; 15:5; 26:5: Pharisees; 24:5: Sect of Nazarenes [Christians]; verse 14: The Way which they call a sect, perhaps in this last instance in a way of reproach; 28:22: This sect everywhere spoken against). (3) Dissensions arising from diversity of opinions and aims (Gal. 5:20: Parties or heresies classed among works of flesh; 1 Cor. 11:19: Must be factions among you that the approved may be known).

The Greek word heresy in the New Testament therefore never means necessarily wrong opinions, and if we omit 2 Peter 2:1, as too late, it never means opinions at all, but either a sect or party, or factions or party divisions. But it was distinctly felt by the

apostles that in the church those parties were reprehensible and from below, not the opinions as such of the parties, but the fact that those holding even the truest opinions held them in a divisive spirit, held them as a center around which to gather people separated in spirit and in body as thus gathered from the general body of believers—that fact was a grief to the apostles; it was an evidence of the working of the evil spirit; it was heresy. Paul was for comprehension. Have whatever opinions you feel you must have, but for your opinions do not divide the church, for that is sin, that is heresy. Hold them in and with the body of believers.

Let us now give a short sketch of heresy in the general sense of wrong doctrine, either as false in itself or as condemned by the church in formal or informal action.

Everybody knows the conflicts which took place between Paul and the Judaizers. What was it all about? The Jewish Christians—and all the first Christians were Jews—were divided into three classes.

(1) There were those who believed that all who came into Christianity must come through Judaism, that is, must be circumcised and keep the law of Moses. These were the special opponents of Paul, and made many a bitter hour for him. If they had succeeded Christianity would never have been heard of as a world religion, but would have been a sect of the Jews. They fought a strong fight but were finally overcome, to which issue the destruction of Jerusalem and the Jewish church-state as such in A.D. 70 and the suppression of the insurrection of Barcochba in 138 greatly contributed. They dwindled into the sect of the Ebionites and finally disappeared.

(2) Those who believed that, while Jews of course were still to be circumcised and keep the law (or as much of it as was still possible to keep), this was not at all binding upon Gentiles, and that for both parties faith in Christ as the only Saviour and Lord was binding. You might call this the regular orthodox party after Pentecost; that is, it included or came to include all the first disciples and all the apostles. Some of these may later have become more liberal, but it was always the party of Peter, John, and the Palestinian followers of Jesus. Especially to this party belonged the towering figure of James, the brother of Jesus, who determined the result in the Council of Jerusalem (Acts 15), the leading spirit and elder (i. e., bishop), in that church for many years (till about 63), and the author of the Epistle of James. The council just spoken of cleared the Gentile Christians of Judaism, except some general precepts of a sanitary or moral nature, and these precepts only in certain territories. (See my reply to Pfleiderer on this in *Crises of the Early Church*, New York, 1912, pp. 18-20.) This party agreed with Paul as to justification by faith, conversion, the sacraments, the Atonement, Christ, etc., as there is no evidence for the statement of "advanced" critics that Paul brought in a new Gospel as to the main principles of Christianity. It is not meant that all had as clearly thought out these principles as Paul, much less had the genius to state them with his brilliancy and driving force, but this Jewish party had no quarrel with Paul on this score. Our sources not only do not tell us of such a quarrel, but they show substantial unanimity. Even James' sharp sentences on justification in his epistle have no reference to Paul at all, and may have been written years before the

latter wrote Galatians and Romans, but were intended to save the Christians from those who in the strength of faith, to which all held, indulged in loose living. James is considering justification from the standpoint of the life *after* the supposed faith, Paul of how we are to get peace with God *before*. Neither contradicts but each supplements the other. The disappearance of this large party eventually was due to the official rejection of Christianity by the regular Jews, and to the persecution of the new faith by the latter. Conversions stopped, and Christianity became a Gentile religion. If the Jews in any large numbers had continued to embrace this their own logical religion, we should have had through the centuries the existence of a Jewish Christianity side by side with that of which we know and are a part. Such an evolution would have been better in some respects than that which really took place, for it would not only have preserved the historical complexion of Christianity as Christ and the apostles left it, but it would have furnished a meeting ground around Christ and the cross for devout Jews in all ages.

(3) The party of Paul. With all of Paul's tremendous emphasis on liberty for the Gentiles, he really took a middle ground between the last mentioned party and that to be referred to in the next paragraph. He not only had not the least objection to the Jews as Christians keeping all their law and continuing to keep it to the end of time if they wished, but he himself as Christian went through trivial Jewish ceremonies in order to placate Jews and gain a point. All that he insisted on was that ideally the whole Jewish law as ceremony, as law, as external commandments and ordinances (not the law as a moral guide to the

conscience, not the law as equal to prophecy), had been abrogated forever in and by Christ, and that in this ideal or religious sense the Jew was as really free from it as the Gentile. But in his historical position the Jew might keep it if he wished, and be an unimpeachable Christian. The Gentiles, however, had never been in that position, and both according to reason and the Old Testament, not to speak of the spiritual elements of Christianity, had no more to do with the law of the Jews than with the laws of Solon. Paul cleared up the relations between the Old Testament and Christianity by showing that every one of the doctrines of the latter had its roots in the former, that therefore Christianity was only the flowering out of a plant that had a thrifty growth in Israel, which was the people of God and shall yet be brought into full obedience to Christ.

There was another party, though not of Jewish Christians—perhaps only in embryo in New Testament times—which rejected Judaism and the Old Testament entirely as a valid historical preparation for Christianity, as itself divinely revealed and standing on its own feet. The Epistle of Barnabas (perhaps 110—not the Barnabas of the New Testament), a widely prized book in ancient times, written on the Codex Sinaiticus of the New Testament, and sometimes read in churches, follows this line. It evaporates the institutions of Judaism into thin air. God never appointed sacrifice, fasting, the Sabbath, temple worship; and unclean meats are simply a figure for bad men. Six days of creation are a type of six thousand years of history, the seventh of a seventh thousand years of rest, to be followed by the eighth of eternity. The literal interpretation of the Old Testament by the

Jews is a diabolical perversion, and the Christians are the true Israel of God, who alone own the Old Testament and have the right to interpret it. Perhaps this view was a reaction against the Jewish persecution of the Christians, getting even with the Jews by denying their divine place, and their book, too, except as allegorized away into cloudland. It reminds us of the attitude of some Christians to-day, to whom the Jews are a race and a religion apart, practically as remote as though they inhabited another planet. The feeling of Barnabas toward Judaism, so very unhistorical and unjust, became that of the whole church—not with respect to its allegory, though that was too much the rule of interpretation, but as regards its general attitude of rejection.

Outside these parties which must be kept in mind to get hold of the drift of New Testament history, there were sporadic false views here and there, on which a word.

Be upon your guard, says Paul, lest there shall be someone carrying you away as a prey through his philosophy and empty deceit, after the tradition of men, after the elements of the cosmos, and not after Christ; for in him dwelleth all the pleroma of the Godhead bodily (Col. 2:8, 9). Paul is not speaking of philosophy generally, but of that special philosophy which was at home in seething Asia Minor, where all kinds of false views had representatives, the precursor of what is known in history as Gnosticism (of which more later), quite likely the actual beginning of it. From their study of the world, or cosmos, they considered it could not be made by the supreme God who dwelt in the fulness, or pleroma, of light, but by some lesser beings. Matter, or body, of which the world is

composed is beneath God's notice, and if Christ was His Son His body could not have been real body at all. Paul calls this a deceitful philosophy of man's invention, having to do with wrong ideas of the cosmos, or world, which they would never have thought of if they had attended to Christ, who was not a lesser being outside of the pleroma of light, but that perfect divine pleroma of Deity itself was in Him, bodily (not in appearance only) incarnated in Him.

A little farther on Paul refers to the practical side of this false teaching. Let no man rob you of your prize by humility and worshiping of the supposed lesser heavenly creators, frequenting or searching the things which he (this errorist) saw (in his clairvoyant or imaginary vision), puffed up by the mind or reason of his flesh, and not holding fast the Head (v. 18). These people affected to think that God was too exalted to be approached except through angels, that Christ was not the Head, not the only Mediator, but that there were others; and thus they boasted of a superior humility to that of Christians generally, paying worship as they did to the lesser divinities (compare the Roman Catholic worship of angels and saints). These rows of intermediaries and the laws and principles of the cosmos which they administered these false teachers professed to "see" by superior science or vision (compare Christian Science), a vision or knowledge which they affected or made a great deal of, which however far from making them really humble puffed them up, ruled as they were not by the soul of the Spirit or even of their own spirit, but by the lower ambitions and faculties, "by the soul of their flesh"—all issuing in not holding the Head, and so being no part of the body (v. 19), the church. These people

pass as quite wise (v. 23) by their arbitrary worship, humility, and asceticisms, which asceticisms, however, are no actual honor to the satisfaction of their fleshly nature.¹

If we put together the references to heretics in the Pastoral Epistles, 1 and 2 Timothy and Titus, we find they believed fables and endless genealogies or the speculative futilities concerning the origin of the aeons; men who have turned aside from purity and simple faith, given to empty talking, and to being law teachers, disputing about words, puffed up though really ignorant, and—what was worse—having a corrupt mind and making money out of their godliness. They speak much of *gnosis*, or knowledge, but it is falsely so called. So far is their doctrine from any consistency and high quality, it is profane babble, in fact, the teaching of demons. They put out arbitrary prohibitions of marriage and of different kinds of food. Some of them are corrupt Jews. They are godless, self-condemned, dealing in Jewish myths, in law points and silly questions and genealogies, and turning away from the truth they take up with the commandments of men. They create factions in the church and overthrow whole houses. Like Christian Science to-day, they make a special appeal to women, and in this case to women of light minds and evil desires. As to faith they are reprobate, and while no catalogue of their doctrinal views is given it is specially mentioned that they reject the bodily resurrection (as the Gnostics did), believing that resurrection took place in the lifting of the spirit into higher knowledge or life. In the Epistle to the

¹Both the so-called Authorized and (strange to say) the Revised Versions miss entirely the meaning of Paul in the last part of verse 23. He means to say that all this self-devised worship and self-denial confer no real honor even in the satisfying of their lower nature. While it ministers to their self-conceit it does nothing more.

Hebrews Gnostics are in mind in the denial by the writer that the God of Christ is any different from the God of the Old Testament (1:1, 2), and in the statement that Christ took real flesh and blood like all the children of men, and did not take the nature of any higher angels or aeons, but the seed of a man so genuinely human as Abraham (2:14-17).

Taking the Johannine writings, a sect of the Gnostics, the Nicolaitans, comes out (Rev. 2:6, 14, 15), a sect apparently immoral. The Thyatira church had not known the "profundities (βᾶθη) of Satan" (2:24), referring to the Gnostic claim to a knowledge of the origin of evil and to the deep things of God. At the very beginning of his Gospel John strikes at the common heresy of his time, that the Creator is distinct both from the supreme God and from the Redeemer. "All things were made by him. * * * The Word was God. * * * The Word was made flesh," not appearing in flesh as a separate person (the man Jesus loosely united to Christ for a time), but made flesh—a real incarnation. As certain denied the reality of Christ's flesh, John will have none of such Gnostic spiritualism. We heard Him, we have seen Him with our eyes (notice the emphasis on physical vision), and our hands have handled Him; nor is He an aeon or spirit far removed from the supreme God or Father, but He was the life, the eternal life, which was with the Father, and our fellowship is with both in an equal degree, not with one without the other ("and our fellowship is with the Father and with his Son Jesus Christ"). (See 1 John 1:1-3.) In fact, you Gnostics are among the false prophets which have gone out into the world, and we know you. If you had confessed that Christ had come in the flesh you would have been

God. But denying the reality of His flesh, you are not only not of God, but you are that spirit of anti-christ of which the church has been hearing, and which is already here in you (1 John 4:1-3; 2 John 7).

To refute these heretics with actual physical demonstration of the reality of Christ's body, he refers to the issue of blood and water from the side of Christ, which is something, says John, we actually saw, and therefore know that what we say is true (John 19:34, 35). The separation of Jesus the man from Christ the heavenly spirit was obnoxious to John, who knew they were one and the same, and He therefore calls that man a liar outright who denies that Jesus is the Christ (1 John 2:22), whereas he who confesses that Jesus is the Son of God, God dwelleth in him (4:15).

It is possible that the statement that Jesus came by water and blood is striking at the same error. Of course, that special form of New Testament error has passed. But the false spiritualism of which it was a manifestation has not passed. Still there are those who say that the actual incarnation of the Son of God in the womb of the Virgin, on which the New Testament lays so much stress, is not important, and indeed that the historical facts in general are not important, that what we need is the spirit of Christ and not so much the earthly facts of His life, death, resurrection, and ascension. It is evident that neither Christ nor the apostles thought so. By the closest association Christ convinced the disciples and the world of the reality of the external facts, and the apostles refer to that reality repeatedly as the foundation of their hope.

If we throw the historical incarnation and the historical deeds connected with it into the fog of uncertainty, we can live for a time on the memory of

what we have lost as a sweet ideal, but the grim reality will at length assert itself, and Christ and His religion will depart into the limbo of forgotten imposters. Over against the Gnostic evaporation of the hard facts of the incarnated life of the Son of God, it was part of the universal consciousness of the first Christians that they did not follow cunningly devised fables when they made known the power and presence (or coming, *parousia*) of our Lord Jesus Christ, for the very reason that they were eyewitnesses of His majesty. For the voice from the Majestic Glory which proclaimed Him as His beloved Son they themselves heard when they were with Him in the holy mount (2 Pet. 1:16, 17). For the reality of those facts they were ready to suffer and die, and for that they did suffer and die.

The glimpses of the Gnostic working which we have seen in the New Testament prepares us for a flowering out in the second century, an expansion of a religious faith, one of the most interesting and surprising in the world. What was Gnosticism? It was the result of brooding over the awful problem of evil and trying to find a solution without bringing in God. Instead of answering it as the Western mind would, as the result of the abuse of freedom, an abuse bound up as possible in the nature of the case in the creation of intelligent free agents (and the creation of any other as the top of the universe was hardly worthwhile), the Eastern mind answered it by involving it in the creation of matter, or in the existence of any beings or worlds less than the Supreme God. The Gnostics held either that from eternity there were two beings or worlds, good and evil, light and darkness, or that a duality or plurality of such beings thus existing

one of them (Sophia, wisdom) became inflamed with love and sank down into Bythos, or supreme deity. This disturbance of deity coincided with the fall of deity into matter, which was previously insensible, and from this disturbance and fall arose evil powers which have continued to hold sway over the world. Another explanation is that the supreme being emanated a world or spirit which as emanated was less divine than the original, and this second world, or being, emanated another still less divine, and so on down till divinity became so exhausted that this present evil world became possible.

These explanations of the origin of evil are so fantastic to us that it seems incredible that they were ever believed. But believed they were, and by men of intelligence. In fact, that was one of the things of which Gnosticism boasted—the superior knowledge (*gnosis*) of its adherents, though it must be remembered that at first the Gnostics were so called, not on account of their finer intelligence, but on account of the *source* of their better knowledge, viz., revelation. It was a special knowledge mystically revealed to them as a secret, and to be guarded from the intrusion of the common man. It has counterparts in part in Christian Science and in part in the revealings of the secret lodge. This secret knowledge had to do with salvation and the way to Heaven, and thus was similar to Christianity. It was very dissimilar, however, as to means. While in Christianity the Saviour was the Son of God and thus essentially divine, the Saviour in Gnosticism was one of a far-off series of aeons. While in the former the means was faith in this Saviour which produced a new life of virtue and truth, the means in the latter, as in Oriental religions generally, was a

lot of magic formulae, holy rites, initiations, and sacraments. There were sealings, baptisms, stigmatizings, piercing ears, etc. These led to the higher knowledge, to protection from demons, and finally to Heaven, provided this higher knowledge gave a clue to the names and nature of the beings or aeons or angels which presided over the seven worlds, or universes, between this world and Heaven, and a clue to the formulae or passwords which could guarantee passage through the realms of these angels.

One line of this belief represented the chief demon and Christ as the two hands of God, the first having authority over this world epoch (the present war gives seeming support to this) and Christ over the next. The part of Gnosticism which had to do with evil powers and worlds (dualism, etc.) was borrowed from the Persian religion (Zoroastrianism), which represents the universe, or the bad part of it, as full of fighting demons, an idea something similar to Paul's (Eph. 6:12). Another side of this dualism, that matter is evil, that the spiritual must be separated from the temporal and the bodily in order to salvation, is derived from the Greek (remember Plato), though it is also an idea at home in the Orient. The astronomical side, viz., that the seven world powers are either identical with the sun, moon, and five planets, or are represented by them, Gnosticism got from Babylonian religion, with this difference, that, while these powers were in Babylonia supreme deities, in our heresy they were demonic powers; and this last feature it got again from Zoroastrianism, a religion which swept widely in the conquering march of Persia.

In the better forms of Gnosticism it was not simply that passage through the seven realms lower than the

highest could be secured by a knowledge of the names and nature of the half-demonic rulers presiding over them, of the formulae to be used in addressing them (compare our secret orders), and of the symbols which must be shown them, but it was also required that the initiate's life should correspond, that he should live a more or less ascetic life. Some schools emphasized this requirement, but others drew the inference that matter being thus objectionable and trivial it could not really hurt the soul, and thus plunged into excesses. Others still believed that, while the spiritual, or ascetics, would rise to the realms of light, a partial salvation was not denied to ordinary Christians, or psychics, while lower people, or hylics (ὕλη, matter), would go to perdition. While Jesus was dovetailed into the system as one of the aeon-redeemers, or the chief one, His place was entirely different from that in Christianity. And the salvation, too, was quite another thing. In one it was a magical release and ascent without reference to historical or ethical reality, in the other it was a new life mediated by an actual Person flowering out in conquest of evil here and now, and in every day virtues of love, fidelity, purity, and truth. On the other hand, the church of the third and following centuries borrowed the secret of the Gnostic appeal in its asceticism, sacramental magic, and esoteric knowledge.

Another wide reaching heresy similar to Gnosticism troubled Christianity much, and in some of its manifestations lasted far on into the Middle Ages. It was Manicheism, founded by Mani, a Persian sage and eclectic religionist, who at the age of twenty-five or thirty (compare Christ's age) began to propagate his pagan Christian dualistic mixture, about 241 A.D. He visited parts of China and India, and, like some of the

Gnostics and Mohammed, claimed to be the last and highest of the prophets who preached the perfect religion. Though he won many converts, he was at last made a victim of the priestly caste, as was Jesus, in this case of the Magi, who had the king crucify him, 276-7. True to his Persian origin, he was an out-and-out dualist—light and darkness, God and Satan, each existing from eternity. At length Satan began to make attacks on the kingdom of light, and to meet him the God of light through the spirit of his right hand begot the primal man (to be distinguished from Adam), and sent him, helped by the five pure elements, zephyr, wind, light, fire, and water, to fight the evil spirit. In this fight the impure elements and the pure got mixed, and have never been separated. Their mixture has as its result the present world, which arose at the command of the God of light. The astronomical element is present here, too. The primal man dwells in the sun, as well as the redemptive spirits; the sun is pure and is a reservoir of any light that may have been won back from Satan. The mother of life has her dwelling in the moon.

The creation of man is the work not of good spirits, as the world is, but of evil, by the conjunction of sin and desire, or cupidity. But in order to dominate better the light he had stolen in the above conflict, Satan hid in man this light. So that Adam is a mixed being, created in Satan's image, yet having in himself light even stronger than Satan, who, to get even, gives Eve to Adam. True to Oriental ideas, Eve is much inferior to Adam in the amount of light she possesses, besides being a temptress through her sensuousness. It looked as though mankind was done for. But good spirits took the human pair under their tutelage, told

them who they were, and warned Adam against yielding to the charms of Eve, who herself was approached by Satan and bore to him Cain and Abel. Adam, however, fell under this temptation and became the father of Seth. Mankind came into the world in this mixed condition, to be exploited by the evil spirits constantly through sensuality, error, and false religions, while good spirits try to regain some of the light for man. The means of the latter is to teach the true knowledge (*gnosis*) of nature and her forces through divinely sent teachers like Noah, Abraham, perhaps Zoroaster and Buddha, and especially Mani. Jesus comes in here, not the historical Jesus nor the Jewish religion which produced Him—both rejected by Mani—but a spirit or phantom Jesus. Those who become partially cleansed from darkness here and are on the way to become elect (this was one view) undergo purgatorial fires beyond. When the elements of light in the world have become completely freed, the God of light allows the whole cosmos to fall to pieces by the angels withdrawing their support. God, the aeons, and just ones leave the universe to its fate of fire. The powers of evil and good separate forever, the kingdom of light above now perfected, and far below the kingdom of darkness.

A system as dualistic as this was of course ascetic, like the Indian faiths. Anything that smacked of matter was rejected in the measure in which it had this reference—all animal food, all traffic in material things, and of course all sexual intercourse. The rigor of the fasts reminds one of the Greek Church, and prayer was made four times a day, with washings preceding, the worshiper turning toward the sun or moon. As in the Catholic Church prayer is addressed not only to the

God of light but to the angels and to Mani himself. As in Catholicism, the high ascetic ideal was impossible except to a select few, who were called the elect or perfect, who, as in Hinduism, were held in superstitious reverence by the common run. These last were called the catechumens, or hearers, and had only to live a moral life, avoiding idolatry, sorcery, avarice, falsehood, fornication, and all killing—certainly a fine scheme if carried out with any spiritual comprehensiveness. As in Catholicism and in India the fakirs or elect did not fare so badly as at first sight might appear, as the hearers kept them well supplied with food, by the eating of which they set free particles of light. In return of course they prayed for the hearers, and, as in some churches, secured for them a shortened sojourn in purgatory.

We must not think that the similarity Catholicism has to various religions means that these borrowed from it, much less Mani, but that the similarity is due rather to a conscious or unconscious borrowing by Catholicism or to common influences on both, and to the ordinary working of human nature. What Mani got from Christianity he got from Gnostic sects that sprang from Marcion, Basilides, and Bardesan. From these he got perhaps his moral law, his rejection of the Old Testament and Judaism, and (if this goes back to Mani) his high opinion of Paul. Harnack well says that the secret of the success of Manicheism was its union of mythology and materialistic dualism to a simple worship and a strict morality. It was entirely free from the sensual features of some Oriental faiths. It also skilfully adapted itself to minds and characters of different grades and thus had a tremendous human appeal, in which the universalism of the Man of

Galilee was completely lacking—He who spoke to *every* man the startling challenge: “Be ye perfect, as my Father who is in heaven is perfect.”

In 1904 the learned world was enriched by German translations, in the proceedings of the Berlin Academy of Sciences, of numerous fragments of Manichean literature found in Turfan in East Turkestan. These fragments show two things: First, that Mani borrowed more from Zoroastrianism than supposed by some; and, second, that he linked his system directly with Jesus (of course, his Jesus). He calls himself the “apostle sent forth of Jesus the friend in the love of the Father, of God.” We read even: “Praise and laud to the Father and the Son and the Holy Spirit.” Was this an effort to win converts from Christianity by assuming that his religion was only a variety of that, as Christian Science to-day?

Manicheism succeeded. After spreading over the East, it went over the Roman Empire. Like Unitarianism it won many rationalistically inclined men. It talked much of freedom, reason, knowledge; it exploited the difficult places of the Old Testament as did Ingersoll, had simple ideas of sin and goodness, rejected the mystery of the incarnation, commended itself to cultured men like the rhetorician Augustine, and won over the secret adherence of some of the clergy of Africa, just as clergy to-day are fascinated by secret cults and the pale ethicism of the lodge. In Christian Rome, between 370 and 440, many scholars and public teachers went over to it. The first pope the church ever had who was both a theologian and a vigorous administrator, Leo the Great (we might call him the first pope anyway), 440-461, was also the first to strike Manicheism with power, and following

his fatherly impulse the Emperor, Valentinian III, decreed banishment to its professors, and Justinian death. This last Christian method was carried out on the Priscillianists, on whom a word in a moment. Manicheism was in part the progenitor of the great sects of the Paulicians, Bogomiles, Cathari, and Albigenses.

Priscillian was a prominent layman in Spain (later bishop) who Gnosticized Paul's idea of the body being the temple of the Spirit to the extent of denying the rightfulness of marriage, or if anyone were married asserting that he must live in absolute abstinence. His very strict ideals attracted many followers who were enrolled as "spirituals" or "abstinents." There has been some discussion as to whether this high-minded and earnest Spaniard was really a heretic, and it is a recent fashion to acquit him entirely. This would mean that the theologians who refuted him and the authorities who condemned him to death and beheaded him and six of his companions at Treves, in 385, were both wicked and wooden, wicked to slay an orthodox man and wooden not to know a fundamental error. And this is true even if we allow with von Schubert that he was condemned for transgressions, as these alleged crimes were really the result of his errors or an excuse to get at him for his errors. Lezius has shown clearly his heretical notions. In fact this one portentous error of denying the holiness of marriage rested on a Gnostic and Manichean extravagance that upset the whole basis of society. So far as heresy was mixed up with his and his companions' violent taking off, which was ostensibly for transgression, the evidence of which was extorted by torture, and so valueless, that taking off was the damnable beginning of a damnable

history which stained the medieval and Reformation church with eternal shame.

The Paulicians were an interesting sect which began in Armenia in the fifth or sixth century, were transplanted to Thrace in 752, fiercely persecuted later, re-formed their ranks in Armenia at Thonrak (Tendarek) in 821, and have existed to this day, if not already massacred in the horrible extermination by which the Turks have been trying deliberately to blot out the Armenian race and religion. We have two sources of Paulician belief, viz., ninth century witnesses, and *The Key of Truth*, a manual of an actual Paulician Church of the nineteenth century, which first appeared in a Western language in a translation by F. C. Conybeare in 1898. According to the former they were dualists; that is, they hold to two original beings, the Heavenly Father, who created the angels and rules the next world, and the demiurge, who was the god of this world and made man. They did not hold to a real incarnation of Christ in the Virgin Mary, but rather a passing through her, *in* her flesh but not *of* it. They allegorized the Supper and denied it as a sacrifice, and cared nothing for baptism as held by the regular church. We ought not to worship the cross. They depreciated Peter. Monks are of the devil. The name church ought not to be given to buildings. They rejected priesthood and had two classes of ministers, associate itinerants and copyists. They seemed to receive most of the New Testament, especially the Gospels and Paul. Christ was a created angel, sent down by God to bless mankind, who endured insults, suffering, and death, rose again, ascended into Heaven, and obtained the title Son of God by way of grace and reward. *The Key of Truth* minimizes the dualistic

elements, provides a form for the eucharist, elevates all the apostles without especially putting Peter down and claims that Christ received His Godhead at His baptism.

It will be noticed that the Paulicians were a protest against the Catholicizing of the church, a survival of the old Adoptionist view of Christ, and an anticipation of the more earnest reformers of the sixteenth century. Like some of these latter, they baptized only adults. Because Christ knew nothing of these late ceremonies, hierarchies, liturgies, churches, sacraments, etc., so they would know nothing of them. They would do only what He did. F. C. Conybeare thinks the Paulicians were the survivors of the Adoptionists of the second century, which if true invests with a living interest these medieval sectaries covered with reproach and death by the Greek Christians.

We cannot understand the widespread heresies of the Middle Ages without bringing in the Bogomiles, probably an offshoot of the Paulicians, and who were known in the twelfth and thirteenth centuries as Bulgari (i. e., Bougres, a name by which they and other heretics came to be known, a name which came to be associated with evil deeds and especially with heresy as the chief sin, which, if one were guilty, was the cause in the popular imagination of attributing to him all the other sins even the most revolting; and so we get the name of bugger, first a heretic, then a sodomite, then a very bad man generally). They were the connecting link between the Manicheans and Paulicians, and the Cathari (Albigenses), and the sect of Russia. Like the Paulicians the Bogomiles were partly Protestant in rejecting the ceremonies, sacraments, etc., of Catholicism, and partly Manichean in

rejecting the doctrines of Christianity, as the divine birth of Christ, the co-existence of the Son and Holy Spirit with the Father, and the reality of the miracles of Jesus. The Bogomiles held that baptism was a purely spiritual rite, and should not be given to children in any case, that there were no priests or regular ministers, that prayers were to be said in private houses, not churches, that every Christian could become elect, and hence monkery was valueless, and that marriage was not a sacrament, nor were images or crosses to be worshiped. God had two sons, Satanail and Michael. The former and elder rebelled against the Father, and after his fall he created the lower heavens and the earth, and tried in vain to create man. But he could not succeed, and had to ask God for the Spirit. Satanail allowed Adam to till the ground on condition that he and his posterity became his servants. To save man Michael was sent in the form of man, became Jesus, and was elected by God after his baptism. He vanquished Satanail and deprived him of the *il* in his name, so that he became just Satan, and it was he (Satan) who brought about the crucifixion and was the originator of the churches, vestments, monks, priests, sacraments, etc., of the Greek and Roman Churches.

But strange to say, though this world was the work of Satan, the Bogomiles did not forbid participation in its pleasures and work, except excess. Their objection against Catholic ceremonies must not lead us to assign them too rational an attitude, as they had various conjurations against evil spirits. They were earnest missionaries and traveled far and wide healing the sick and casting out demons, like the apostles. Like the Manicheans and Paulicians they used apocryphal

books, as well as the Scriptural books, and spread an immense heretical literature, which has mostly perished or been changed. Their chief seats were the Balkan states, and during all the Middle Ages they were active either secretly or openly both there and far beyond and certainly must have helped to prepare the way for the Reformation.

In the golden age of the Middle Ages, say the twelfth, thirteenth, and fourteenth centuries, there were several groups of heretics, of which the Paulicians and the Bogomiles were examples, like the Bulgars, Concoricii, Albanenses, the Weavers, or Tixerands, and Albigenses, which have all been classed as the Pure, or Cathari. They were of course persecuted by the church, and her historians have sought to justify this by saying that the Cathari were either immoral or believed in tenets which would have disrupted society. It is true that they were Manichean as to two eternal gods or principles, good and evil, and the perfect had to abjure marriage, must fast severely, not eat animals and not take an oath. But the larger class was the credentes, or believers, who were not bound by so unworldly a rule. The charge of immorality was false, as the Cathari were really the Puritans of the Middle Ages. They had many beliefs and customs which remind one much of ancient times in the church and some of Christ's own words.

All these groups rejected infant baptism; in fact, most of them water baptism itself. The ceremony of consolamentum, or baptism with Spirit and fire, with the perfect, took the place of baptism, as it washed away original sin and gave the gift of immortality. In the Eucharist the people go up to the table and say the Our Father. At the close of this prayer the

leader takes the bread and says: "Thanks be to the God of our Jesus Christ. May the Spirit be with us all." And after that he breaks and distributes to all. "And such bread is called bread blessed. Although no one believes that out of it is made the body of Christ. The Albanenses, however, deny that it can be blessed or sanctified, because it is corporeal" (material). It is evident that they repudiated any Catholic idea of the Supper. But they had one custom, similar to that of the ancient church, of sending portions of the bread to friends at long distances, and on the death bed this could take the place of the consolamentum. F. C. Conybeare writes with exaggeration yet with some truth: "The influence of Catharism on the Catholic Church was enormous. To counteract it celibacy was finally imposed on the clergy, and the great mendicant orders evolved; while the constant polemic of the Cathari teachers against the cruelty, rapacity, and irascibility of the Jewish tribal god led the church to prohibit the circulation of the Old Testament among laymen. The sacrament of extreme unction was also evolved by way of competing with the death bed consolamentum."

To the ordinary English reader the Albigenses are the only party of the Cathari who are well known. This knowledge is due to the fearful persecutions to which they were subjected in the South of France at the command of popes during most of the thirteenth century and to the view formerly held that the Albigenses were a kind of Protestants before the Reformation, quite evangelical. No new knowledge has done away with the facts from which sprang the gloomy impression of those burnings (two hundred Cathari were burned in one day in a certain town) and

butcheries; but it is now known that the Albigenses, the name of the Provençal heretics, were really heretics, more or less Manichean in their dualism, but whose morality, diligence, and value as citizens made Count Raymond VI of Toulouse refuse to persecute them and should have saved his land from seas of innocent blood.

Before we speak of Socinus, a word as to the heresies with respect to Christ. Some essential oneness of Christ with the Father was the undoubted faith of the early Christians, who could not, as Harnack concedes, express too highly their thought of Christ, often even bluntly calling Him God. But as time passed and attempts were made to unfold and rationally state the relation of the two, differences came out. In the second and third centuries a reaction toward a too bare monotheism assumed two forms, the effort being to preserve both God as one and Christ as divine. The first was found especially among simple heathen believers, who wanted no high-spun explanations. To them Christ was simply God the Father in His earthly mode or form or manifestation, and after He had wrought the work of salvation the Father changed Himself into another mode or form, the Holy Spirit. This solved the problem by saying that there was no problem, that Christ was simply the highest God. This was the Sabellian, or Patripassian, Monarchianism, and is represented even to-day by thinkers who, not understanding the true doctrine of the Trinity, stumble at it as tritheism.

The second form was that God the Father entered into the mere man Jesus in the form of the spirit Christ, especially at His baptism. After this spirit came in, Jesus became a kind of God, and especially after His

resurrection could even be called God. Those who held this view, very similar to the view of many "liberals" to-day, were called dynamistic Monarchians, because of this entrance of the *power* of God into Jesus at a distinct time. The Patripassian heresy was shattered on the facts of Christ's earthly life, who prayed to the Father as to a distinct being and referred to Him as to a second person whom He served and loved; and the dynamistic heresy was shattered on the universal consciousness of the Christians that in Jesus Christ they had not a God-filled man more or less, but a Saviour and Lord whom, as the Son of God, they believed in and worshiped. It may be, however, that a form of this second theory lived on in far places as Adoptionism, and appeared later in Paulicianism (that through this endowment by God and Christ's fidelity to it and to His mission He was *adopted* as Son by the Father).

The next heresy on Christ was a modification of the dynamistic one brought in by the courtly friend and minister of Queen Zenobia of Palmyra, Paul of Samosata, about 260, who was a link to Arius. He believed that Christ had no pre-existence with God in any sense, yet He was born miraculously (as believed also by the Dynamists), was endowed by the Spirit of God at His birth, and also received at some time the Logos, or Word or Reason, of God (this Word, or Reason, being simply an attribute, or power, of God). Thus furnished He achieved a perfect moral unity with God and with that His work. The "modern" man would think it strange that this theory was no sooner broached than it was condemned by councils in Antioch, and, as the church historian Eusebius says, "his false doctrine was clearly shown before all, and

he was excommunicated from the Catholic Church under Heaven." The church could not take an endowed man when it had the Son of God.

An earnest, ascetic, and fiery preacher of Alexandria, Arius, the pupil of the presbyter Lucian of Antioch, who was pupil of Paul of Samosata, greatly restive under this worship of Christ, as he thought reflected on God the Father. He accordingly began to preach against it, teaching that we must explain the Sonship of Christ in the terms of time or creation, not as an expression of a fact involved in the very being of God as Father. The Son has a historical existence, not an essentially divine existence. At some point in eternity God called Him into being, before which time He did not exist at all. The Word, *Logos*, is to be distinguished from the Son, the former being simply divine energy or wisdom, in which the Son after His creation participated. Though the Son by nature is created and changeable, God saw that He would remain good and true, and so conferred upon Him in advance the divine glory that He merited. He therefore can be called "God," and "Son of God" (of course only in a relative or accommodated sense). This is the celebrated Arian view of Christ, which was seized with avidity by some, and was substantially the view of many in England in the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries. It commended itself therefore to able men, but the modern "liberal" will have none of it. The Harvard Divinity School, ever since the learned Dr. Frederick H. Hedge lectured there in the chair of church history (1857 and later), has thrown it out, and of course the German rationalists could not bear it. You cannot have half a God, or a God who started to be, and the "liberal" of to-day is much

more logical in assuming that Christ is what the poet and dreamer Novalis called the philosopher Spinoza, the God-intoxicated man.

As is well known, the general Council of Nicaea, in 325, not only condemned the views of Arius with only two or three dissenters, but put down a positive counterpart in their own doctrine, which probably expresses as nearly as we can ever come in a human creed the reality of Christ on His divine side—His Deity as we know it to be witnessed by Scripture, history, and experience, and His subordination to the Father, from whom He derives His being, not by creation (as He would not then be divine) but by begetting, which secures at once His divinity and subordination and the unity of the Godhead, a unity mounting up to the Father as the source and life of His manifold being, Father, Son, and Spirit. The eminent theologian Rothe says (*Kirchengeschichte*, published in 1875, ii, 19) that, so far as the Nicene Creed preserved the consciousness that in Christ there is a revelation of *God Himself* and a redemption through *God Himself* (italics his), it was true and in the interests of Christianity itself; but that it injured another equally Christian idea, strict monotheism, for one can never get the numerical unity of God from the Nicene formula. But that follows only if the numerical unity of God is a simple or bare unity, and not if it is a complex and manifold unit. We hold against Mohammedanism that the life of God is not bare and sterile, but a rich, manifold activity. It is a numerical unit, but you don't exhaust it in saying that.

Our boyhood days were troubled with the specter of the Pelagians—"original sin consisteth not in the

following of Adam, as the Pelagians do vainly talk"—it being understood that, over against the true view of an inherited corruption from Adam, Pelagius, the fifth century British (perhaps Irish or Scotch) monk taught that any so-called corruption that we had came not by a wicked nature from Adam, but by imitation by following bad examples. This was certainly an easy-going explanation, for the questions still remain how we got the evil examples to follow, and why we always follow the evil and not the good. But Loofs has shown that the heresy of Pelagius is largely imaginary, or that it is the after-clap of too much Augustinianism, a protest in the interest of morality against overdriving total depravity, enslaved will, and such doctrines. It builds on the Greek theology, and is in direct descent from the universal teaching of the Greek-speaking Christians of ancient times. That does not mean that it is true or false; it only means that when it came out it was not heretical. To the Latin Church it became heretical, and this suspicion was inherited by the Reformers of the sixteenth century, and so it is condemned in the Reformation creeds. It is hardly necessary to say that, if Pelagianism is the denial of original defect, and the necessity of the enabling and converting grace of God, it contradicts both Scripture and human experience, though that is not saying it had not much of truth and justice.

In spite of what Frederick W. Robertson, whose *Life and Letters*, by Brooke, is the most quickening and gripping biography of the nineteenth century, says of truth lying in opposites rather than in a mean between, it is better to be cautious of extreme statements, and to wonder whether discrimination in thinking and moderation in language does any harm to

truth. Even Luther said: "There never was a heresy that did not contain something of truth."

In the wake of Pelagius, in our early education in antipathy, came the Socinians. The Sozzini were two educated and able Italians of the middle of the sixteenth century, uncle and nephew (the latter died 1604), who were parts of quite a strong anti-trinitarian current in that spirit-moving age. Taking their own teaching and that of their followers as one whole, we may put the Socinian creed in this way. Man was created in the divine image in the sense of having rule over all creation, not as being immortal or having all knowledge. In this last respect the first man was rather a child. His fall is easily explained. His intelligence was small, his moral will inexperienced, his sensuousness stronger than his reason, and the sensuous temptation occasioned by the prohibition befuddled his weak reason and led to transgression. And even that was only an externalizing of what was already hidden in him. But by that fall neither he nor his posterity lost their freedom. They can still choose the good. There may be a tendency to evil in all, but you can't prove it, and in any case it is not the result of any sin in Adam. Original sin is not sin at all, in the proper sense, as it has no guilt. Men are born in the same condition as Adam was, for his fall took from him nothing essential to his nature. Man is now simply left to his natural mortality. Through constant sinning throughout the generations, a habit of sinning has been created, a kind of sinful depravation of mankind, and when that depravation has been induced it is transmitted by natural law. This has weakened man's freedom, and, though he can himself conquer gross sins, he needs divine help to come to salvation.

That help is offered him in the Gospel, which elevates man even over Adam's state. Christ is a true man and nothing more, as to essential divinity, though He has been equipped with wisdom and power from God without measure, with immortality and other extraordinary qualities. Christ could not communicate anything to us unless He were entirely man. Though He had to die as a man, His gift of immortality assured His resurrection, and that immortality He confers upon us, which is the chief thing in salvation, the chief thing He came for. Christ has not only all power, but He is also perfect holiness. So in a sense He is God and may be worshiped. Some Socinians said it was illogical and wrong to worship Christ, but Fausto Sozzini himself and most of his followers defended it on the ground that the honor reverted through Christ to the Father. God is to be worshiped as the original Cause of all things, Christ as He *through* whom are all things. Christ had a pre-existence with God and was born miraculously.

An atonement is utterly rejected. The death of Christ belongs only to His kingly office, and has to do with sealing His revelation, a solemn confirmation of its truth. The other seals are His miracles and His holy life. But the death is mostly important because it leads to the resurrection, which is the head and foundation of all our salvation. Christ sits at the right hand of God and all power is given unto Him. Justification by faith is taught, but in a little different shape than ordinarily. Faith is assent to the teaching of Jesus, is trust in God through Christ, which is the same as trust in Christ, and is obedience to God's commandments; this secures salvation not on account of Christ's work, but so far as it leads to obedience

and trust in the promise of eternal life. There is no reckoning of the righteousness of Christ, nor taking hold of it. Salvation comes not so much through faith as through obedience. Christ's main work is instruction. The Lord's Supper is a remembrance of the death of Christ. Baptism was only for the first times and was an external sign of conversion from Judaism or heathenism. Those who are born in the church do not need it, nor do children, who besides cannot understand it. But since infant baptism is an old custom it need not be entirely condemned.

Like others of the Reformation parties who revived the ethics of Jesus, the Socinians opposed force in religious things and partly in secular. The state must keep out of church matters and not punish heretics. The heretic or other person should not lift himself against the state in any way whatever, but suffer wrong without complaint. The Christian must not, of course, do wrong, even at the command of the state. While a Christian might defend himself against a robber, he must not go to war or carry on any offensive fight. A Christian might hold office if there were no criminal justice to execute, but to inflict death on fellow mortals is against Christ. Finally it should be said that there is no literal resurrection of the body, but there will be a spiritual body. The punishment of the wicked is to be annihilation. Immortality and eternal life are firmly held.

The Sozzini and their followers were the first Christians who, standing firmly on a historical revelation, brought in alleviating considerations of a rationalistic tenor which, while they made Christianity quite another thing, commended it to thousands of minds who stagger at its sturdy supernaturalism. On account

of the persecuting measures of Catholics and Protestants, Socinians did not make a big stir in the Reformation period, but they later came to their own with a vengeance. Unitarianism and the so-called liberalism in evangelical churches go back to the daylight of Sozzini, who escaped with his life but with a bruised body from a mob which wrecked his house in Cracow in 1598 because of his heresies.

Following the clear and masterly survey which my friend Professor Albert Henry Newman gives of the Anabaptists of the Reformation times in his *Church History* (ii, 148-200. 1903), I might say that they show something of the same influences from the study of the New Testament which played upon the Sozzini. The Anabaptists tried to revive the spirit and in part the forms of charitable service of the apostolic times. Some of them even restored communism, and achieved much success in socialistic organization. They revived the apostolic ideal of a regenerated church membership and desired to exclude worldly or ungodly persons from fellowship. Like the Socinians later, and much more so, they were bitterly opposed to infant baptism because it was unscriptural, contrary to their favorite idea of a regenerate membership, and was the presupposition of a church-state system which they knew only in persecuting forms. (They did not introduce immersion, partly because immersion was largely used by all, or if not used the invalidity of pouring was not a question.) And that church-state system they repudiated as contrary to the Gospel, and especially its damnable persecutions.

The Anabaptists of all ages have the honor of being the consistent and unswerving devotees of liberty of conscience. On account of the unholy alliance of

church and state they thought their members ought not to assume political or civic office; nor should they take an oath, as that was forbidden by the Master. Like Fausto Sozzini, they would have nothing to do with war, and they carried Christ's principles so far as not to defend themselves, and like Sozzini also they thought capital punishment unchristian. They believed Luther's idea of faith and of enslaved will dangerous to morality, and they insisted early and late on good works as the fruit of faith and as indispensably necessary. Not only so, the Christian must imitate Christ's self-denying life. Like the Puritans and Methodists they emphasized renunciation of worldly amusements, of display of clothing and adornment, and of riches, as inconsistent with the following of Christ. They have been reproached by certain historians for being ascetics, for following in the line of Catholic monasticism, but their approach was really quite different. With them there were not two ideals of the Christian life, one for the common run of a more or less worldly and sinful career which God would overlook as debarring from salvation if mass was attended and confession made once a year, and the other of an ascetic renunciation which purchases superabundant merit on earth and higher reward in Heaven. For the Anabaptists such renunciation for Christ was only the normal walk laid down by Christ and the apostles for all. They highly valued the Lord's Supper and guarded it from any but baptized believers in good standing. It will be seen from the above that they took the New Testament seriously, and from that standpoint rejected the standing churches as unchristian. The latter paid them back in worse than their own coin, for, while the Anabaptists

were inoffensive as to any act against their contemporaries, they were met by these with fire and sword. (I leave out Münzer and the Münster fanatics, as these did not represent the normal Anabaptist movement.)

So far as heresy was concerned, individuals in a few of the Anabaptist groups had views that came under that head. Pantheistic and mystical views overclouded objective reality at times, the value of the external word and ordinances, the atonement, the church as it was at that time; and some had erroneous views of Christ. The Anabaptists must not be confounded with the modern Baptists, as the latter, though sharing of course many of their beliefs, have had a different origin and history.

We come to the Unitarian movement in America. The first covenants of the Pilgrim and Puritan churches had no doctrinal requirement; but that meant that, for church membership, the service of God only was in mind, not a pledge to the truth of God, and not at all that that truth as commonly understood in its essential respects was not vital. The Unitarianism of the eighteenth century in New England was rather the result of a cold intellectualism out of sympathy with the warm currents of religious life, partly caused by extravagances which flowed as abuses from the Great Awakening and other revivals (these abuses not being a logical outcome), of a reaction from the reigning Calvinism, and of overelaborate attempts of the creeds to define the Trinity. If the Trinity had been rationally explained, if forbidding aspects of theology had been eliminated in favor of the universalism of Christ and Paul, if a finer fraternal spirit had been shown, and especially if an earnest religious life

had been cultivated, it is doubtful if Unitarianism would have been heard of in America. If atonement had been conceived psychologically as a process in the life of God instead of too legally and externally, it may be that another strong impulse to the movement would have been lacking.

But instead of asking (a defect common to all "liberals"): What is the truth underlying the historic creeds? What is the valuable element which has given vitality to the universal faith of Christianity from the beginning till now? the Unitarians threw out the child with the bath—first, the atonement; second, the essential Deity of Christ; after that, His pre-existence; and, lastly, His miracles; and for these they substituted "salvation by character," revived from Stoicism, for salvation from sin through faith in Christ. This progressive elimination of all the deeper elements of Christianity and every distinctive message which is proclaimed as its evangel, this desupernaturalizing of it, this bringing it down to the level of ethical culture—this was possible only where society already Christian had forgotten the forces which made it what it was, and where Christian leaders were no longer grappling with the souls of lost men and women. Fidelity to the evangelistic impulse which Christ gave to Christianity would have prevented the Unitarian evolution, or at least would have been a tremendous counteracting force.

The man who gave the downward trend to Unitarianism, so far as historic Christianity was concerned, was Theodore Parker (died 1860), a man of intense intellectual life and of religious influence second to few or none in this country. He reduced Christianity to morality, to love to God and man, and

denied final value to the Bible, Christ, and Christianity. The elder Unitarians were of course scandalized beyond measure, but it is doubtful with what logical consistency. Parker was one of the greatest and noblest Americans that ever lived, and in after effects he encompassed a thousand years in his short life. From him has come the present-day Unitarianism through Chadwick and Savage, two bold and brilliant witnesses, who further emasculated the faith of Chauncy, James Freeman, Channing, James Freeman Clarke, and Orville Dewey. Of that same fountain, into which streams have poured from many sources, especially from Germany, have drunk hundreds of preachers in our evangelical churches. These are slowly transforming the Christianity of Christ and the apostles, retaining some more, some less, of the original elements. Other cults have also come in, some, like Eddyism, revivals in part of ancient heresies, others a mixture of Unitarianism and mind cure, like Waldo Trinism, and others still an importation from the pagan Orient, like Buddhism and recent developments of Hinduism.

"Every spirit that confesseth," said John, "that Jesus Christ is come in the flesh is of God" (1 John 4:2). If we hold fast to the incarnation, to the Head which is Christ, and to those truths and deeds which He taught and accomplished, we may be undisturbed by manifold new gospels. If they have any truth, it is already ours, because it is Christ's, who is the Truth. But we cannot leave Him for these flickering lights. "Lord, to whom shall we go? Thou hast the words of eternal life" (John 6:68).

MADISON, NEW JERSEY.

THE POWER OF THE WILL IN CONVERSION

By JAMES H. SNOWDEN, D. D.

Professor of Systematic Theology in Western Theological Seminary

I

CONVERSION is a turning of the soul from sin unto God and is primarily an act of the mind and will. This fact is clearly expressed in the Greek word *metanoia*. This word is translated "repentance" in both the Authorized and the Revised Version of the New Testament, but this translation is misleading. The word "repentance" emphasizes a change of feeling in penitence, or pain for sin. But *metanoia* means a change of mind.

In his book entitled *The Great Meaning of Metanoia*, Treadwell Walden brings out this fact. "*Nous*," he says, "is the precise equivalent of 'mind.' *Meta* is a preposition which, when compounded with *nous*, means *after*. *Metanoia* is the after-mind: perception, knowledge, thought, feeling, disposition, will, *afterward*. The mind has entered upon a new stage, upon something beyond." He quotes a correspondent as follows: "The root of *meta* is the English 'mid,' and *meta* is at bottom the English 'amid.' From this idea (one of situation) it progresses to another idea of *direction*; and in this use it has the sense of 'going right against,' in the sense of 'striking fair and square,' or 'right in the *middle*.' Thus it gets the meaning of oppositeness of direction, and its force in 'metanoia' is to show that the action of the mind is now precisely in the opposite direction to what was before the case."

De Quincey had grasped this meaning and is quoted as saying: "I understand by metanoia a revolution of thought—a great intellectual change—in accepting a new center for all moral truth from Christ; which center it was that subsequently caused all the offense of Christianity to the Roman people." Matthew Arnold is also quoted as saying: "Of 'metanoia,' as Jesus used the word, the lamenting one's sins was a small part; the main part was something far more active and fruitful, the setting up an immense new inward movement for obtaining the rule of life. And 'metanoia,' accordingly, is a change of the inner man."

Rev. Mr. Walden says on the meaning of the word: "That spiritual perception of the right and the true which grows within and around a mind that is being gradually educated up to the divine standard; the nature wide open in the front, not only looking behind, and receiving the whole counsel of God, not a part of it; every faculty enlightened, every feeling inspired; the entire man engaged; conviction, not excitement; earnestness, not impulse; habitude, not paroxysm; the heart tempered by the understanding, the understanding warmed by the heart; this, the consummate and yet attainable condition. * * * This is not conveyed in the 'Repent ye!' of our Gospels, nor does it come within the range of much of the teaching which falls on the world's ear. The all-encompassing grandeur of an announcement which takes in the whole life, to let his character grow under this great knowledge, to let his conduct fall into the lines of the revealed divine will—all this is lost."

When John the Baptist began his ministry, saying: "Repent ye; for the kingdom of heaven is at hand";

¹Treadwell Walden, *The Great Meaning of Metanoia*, pp. 23, 24.

when Jesus began preaching: "Repent ye, and believe the Gospel"; and when Peter climaxed and closed his great sermon on the day of Pentecost with the call: "Repent ye, and be baptized every one of you in the name of Jesus Christ," each of these preachers called out to his hearers: Change your minds! Change your minds! This is the cry that rings through the New Testament from beginning to end; and it is to this day the initial word and call of the Gospel. Conversion is an act and movement of the whole mind and soul out of sin into righteousness.

II

This change is not a sheer or blind act of the will, but a rational process. The general means by which conversion is brought about is the creation of a new interest, a changed view and vision of life, the introduction into the mind and heart of a more powerful motive, or, in Dr. Chalmers' famous phrase, "the expulsive power of a new affection."

"A great and priceless thing," says Mark Twain in one of the fine serious passages scattered through his books, "is a new interest! How it takes possession of a man! how it clings to him, how it rides him! I strode onward from Schwarenbach hostelry a changed man, a reorganized personality. I walked in a new world, I saw with new eyes. I had been looking aloft at the giant snow-peaks only as things to be worshiped for their grandeur and magnitude, and their unspeakable grace of form; I looked up at them now, as also things to be conquered and climbed. My sense of their grandeur and their noble beauty was neither lost nor impaired; I had gained a new interest in the mountains without losing the old ones. I followed the steep lines

up, inch by inch, and noted the possibility or impossibility of following them with my feet. When I saw a shining helmet of ice projecting from the clouds, I tried to imagine I saw files of black specks toiling up it roped together with a gossamer thread.”

Such is the effect of a new interest upon us. It wakes up our dormant powers, renews our fatigued faculties, enlivens our satiated senses, dispels any gloom and discouragement and pessimism that have been hanging around our spirits, reorganizes our whole personality and lifts our life to a new level. Many a life that has been worn out and lost all hope has blazed up into an intense fire of energy and enthusiasm when touched with the torch of a new interest. Then some mountain that has long stood in sight and become a familiar and commonplace thing suddenly takes on new meaning and power, and the soul views it with searching gaze from base to summit and is absorbed in its wonders and resolves to conquer its heights.

Conversion is such a change. The soul can be lured from sin only as it is drawn by some more powerful attraction. Sin can be driven out of the heart only as it is crowded out by some stronger good. A heart that is simply swept empty of evil will presently be visited and occupied by seven devils more vicious than the one expelled, and its last state will be worse than the first. We can persuade men to leave the old life only as we offer them something better. This is strikingly illustrated in notable conversions. “God is” was the thought that let the first light into Tolstoy’s groping soul. “I want to be like Joe,” was the pitiful cry of Old Born Drunk in Harold Begbie’s *Twice-*

²A Tramp Abroad, Vol. II, p. 73.

born Men. "I was not disobedient unto the heavenly vision," was the experience and testimony of Paul.

Conversion, then, being an act of the mind, does not begin with the emotions, fears or hopes. The way to win converts is not first to stir up the feelings into a frenzy of excitement, but to present some great and worthy new interest that will lead men to change their minds and turn from sin unto righteousness and God. Christianity is ever a rational religion, and its great instrument is preaching the truth. It appeals to the minds and motives of men. It reasons, as Paul did when "he reasoned of righteousness, self-control, and the judgment to come." And so preaching is not ranting; it is sound and severe reasoning.

The way to move the will to obedience is to stir up the appropriate feelings, and the way to stir the feelings is to create and intensify the proper thought, and the way to create the thought is to present some efficient object that operates by the expulsive power of a new interest. In general, this new interest in religion is the stronger attraction of a better life in fellowship and service with Jesus Christ. The righteousness and reward, the duty and beauty and blessedness of likeness with Christ and service in His Kingdom, are to be held up and enriched and intensified by associations into a powerful magnet to draw men out of their sin to the Saviour. Conversion is thus at bottom the impact and contagion of one personality on another. This personal contact and contagion may at first be that of a parent, teacher, pastor or friend, but at the last it is the impact and power of the person of Jesus Christ on the soul, the entrance of His Spirit into the conscience and heart so as to capture the soul

and bind it to Him in faith and fellowship and service; and this is salvation.

III

At this point arises a very important psychological and ethical question in connection with conversion: Being an act of the mind and judgment, a question of truth and duty, how can we urge men to believe on Jesus Christ when the evidence does not convince them of the Saviourhood of Christ? How can a man believe in God when his logic drives him into agnosticism? Ought not a man to be loyal to his sense of truth above everything else?

The first answer to this question is that a man ought first and above all to be loyal to his sense of truth. Truth is a primary virtue and duty of the mind, the fundamental basis of all character and conduct, the highest obligation of the human soul. And our preaching should always recognize and respect and emphasize this duty. Never should we give the impression that men are to believe the Gospel or receive a creed irrespective of its truth, as an arbitrary choice of the will, or as a traditional and partisan attitude and act. "I adjure thee that thou speak unto me nothing but the truth," said an ancient king to a Hebrew prophet (2 Chron. 18:15), and the Christian minister, disciple of Him who said: "I am the truth," should obey the same injunction to-day. Our intuitional conscience affirms the supremacy and inviolability of truth, and the proverbs of many languages proclaim the same fact. "Let the truth prevail though the heavens fall." "Buy the truth and sell it not." "The truth is always right," said Sophocles, and John Locke wrote: "To love truth for truth's sake is the principal

part of human perfection, and the seed-plot of all other virtues."

However, when we have emphasized this attitude toward truth we have not said all that is to be said on this point. It is not by a mere act of the will that the sinner is urged to turn from sin to righteousness in conversion, but by a change of mind that involves all his faculties, his reason and motives and feelings, as the ground of the decision and action of the will. The sinner ought not to be converted or yield to conversion against his reason, but he should yield only in accordance with the full play of his reason and his whole mind.

The matter of believing truth is not as clear and simple as at first sight it may seem. Truth is not an object that stands over against the mind in such lucidity and certainty that all we have to do is just look at it and then we cannot miss it. "No bell tolls," says Professor James, "to let us know for certain when truth is in our grasp." On the contrary, truth, especially moral and religious truth, is something for which we select the materials and then put them together in form and meaning; that is, ethical truth is something we make.

The field of consciousness swarms with sense perceptions, concepts, memories, feelings, desires, ideas, and ideals. The mind is not indifferent and helpless in the presence of this complex field, but it has various affinities and interests and has the power of choosing the object it will fasten upon and make the focus of its attention. The stream of consciousness is not an ungovernable flood on which the will floats rudderless and helpless, but the soul has its own rudder and engine by which it can steer and drive its boat to its own desti-

nation. It can throw its attention upon any point in its consciousness, as a searchlight can be thrown around the horizon, and wherever it falls and is fixed the idea under its light blazes up into vividness. Associations then begin to gravitate to this central idea in an increasing mass. All the knowledge and experiences and memories in the mind, having any affinity with the central object, gather around it, swelling and enriching its volume and meaning and power. At the same time these associated ideas kindle their appropriate emotions, and they add their fire to the central mass and turn it into a blazing heap. And thus the attention piles fuel on an idea and converts what at first may be a mere spark or pale cold image into the hot spot and burning focus of consciousness which moves the will and masters the life. In this selective power of the attention lies the sovereignty of the soul over its own intellectual and ethical life.

This selective attention, however, is itself subject to the influence of our moral disposition. Our prevailing instincts and impulses, aims and ambitions, ideas and ideals, subtly but powerfully infect and form, color and mold, our beliefs and determinations. Everyone knows how his own attitude and action, mood and temper, disposition and habits, and especially how his interests and desires and passions, tend to sway and shape his belief and choice. If a man wants to carry through a dishonest transaction it is easy for him to believe that he has a right to do so. If one does not want to believe in God his desire may breed an agnostic doubt and feed it into lusty strength. Our beliefs are largely subject to our interests and desires, and we can make them grow or cause them to wither at the subtle bidding of our hearts. This, however, does not destroy

or impair our free agency and responsibility, for we are responsible for our moral disposition and desires. Our disposition and character are the result of our own repeated choice and action, for we have formed this soil out of which our life grows by constantly dropping into it our own free acts, as the forest by shedding its leaves forms its own loam. The soul thus selects and creates its own beliefs and is responsible for its decisions and deeds.

IV

In a still deeper sense we create our own ethical ideals and beliefs. In many instances an ethical truth is true only as we make it true. Our faith is a fact in process of realization. An ideal of character is obviously realized only as we believe in it and commit ourselves to it in obedience. We make our own moral life, and our faith in such a life precedes and conditions and creates it. The same principle extends to other lives; we can make their lives good only as we believe in goodness and as we have faith in them. And, extending the same principle, we can make a good world for ourselves in so far as we believe in the possibility of such a world and commit ourselves to it in conviction and courage, service and sacrifice. It is our right and it is within our power to vote for a rational universe and good world, and our faith will turn this belief for us into fact. Ethical objects are not what they are independently of us, but in large degree we make them what they are for us; and herein lies a large part of our responsibility.

Professor William James, in his book entitled *The Will to Believe*, has worked out this view into completeness, stating it with all its limitations and guard-

ing it from misunderstanding and misapplication, and the following quotations indicate his line of thought:

There are, then, cases where a fact cannot come at all unless a preliminary faith exists in its coming. *And where faith in a fact can help create the fact*, that would be an insane logic which should say that faith running ahead of scientific evidence is "the lowest kind of immorality" into which a thinking being can fall. Yet such is the logic by which our scientific absolutists pretend to regulate our lives! * * * The freedom to believe can only cover living options which the intellect cannot by itself resolve; and living options never seem absurdities to him who has them to consider. When I look at the religious question as it really puts itself to concrete men, and when I think of all the possibilities which both practically and theoretically it involves, then this command that we shall put a stopper on our heart, instincts, and courage, and *wait*—acting of course meanwhile more or less as if religion were *not* true—till doomsday, or till such a time as our intellect and senses working together may have raked in evidence enough—this command, I say, seems to me the queerest idol ever manufactured in the philosophic cave. * * * Often enough our faith beforehand in an uncertified result *is the only thing that makes the result come true*. * * * If your heart does not *want* a world of moral reality, your head will assuredly never make you believe in one. * * * This life *is* worth living, we can say, *since it is what we make it, from the moral point of view*. * * * I confess that I do not see why the very existence of an invisible world may not in part depend on the personal response which any one of us may make to the religious appeal. God Himself, in short, may draw vital strength and increase of being from our fidelity. For my own part, I do not know what the sweat and blood and tragedy of this life mean, if they mean anything short of this. If this life be not a real fight, in which something is eternally gained for the universe by success, it is no better than a game of private theatricals from which one may withdraw at will. But it *feels* like a real fight—as if there were something really wild in the universe which we, with all our idealities and faithfulnesses, are needed to redeem; and first of all to redeem our own hearts from atheisms and fears.³

³The Will to Believe, pp. 23-61.

Browning teaches the same truth in Bishop Blougram's Apology:

Once own the use of faith, I'll find you faith.

* * * * *

You criticise the soul? it reared this tree—
This broad life and whatever fruit it bears!

* * * * *

Like you this Christianity or not?
It may be false, but will you wish it true?
Has it your vote to be so if it can?
Trust you an instinct silenced long ago
That will break silence and enjoin you love
What mortified philosophy is hoarse,
And all in vain, with bidding you despise?
If you desire faith—then you've faith enough.

But who taught this principle of psychology long before philosopher and poet expressed it? He who said: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself." This truth is frequently expressed in the Bible. "The meek will he guide in justice; and the meek will he teach his way." "The friendship of Jehovah is with them that fear him; and he will shew them his covenant."

The principle of this method is that "obedience is the organ of spiritual knowledge," to use the title of Frederick W. Robertson's famous sermon on the subject. When we enter upon a line of obedience to a truth it unfolds before us in clearness and certainty, opening before us as a road out of a forest. Experience proves it step by step, and then shadows and clouds are swept from its path as morning mist before the sun. It is thus we learn any science and art. We really know these things only as we do them. We can-

not start out with a complete knowledge of any subject; we gain only a glimpse of it, and this grows into clearness as we follow it up in obedience. It is thus the chemist or musician masters his science or art.

And just so is it in the field of religion. We cannot know much spiritual truth until we obey it, and obedience ever opens the way from partial knowledge or belief into fuller understanding and surer faith. The sinner at the moment of his conversion is not required or asked to believe everything in the creed or in the Bible. He need only have a sense of his sin and a desire for a better life. God may be a dim conception to him, and his knowledge of Christ very fragmentary and defective and even erroneous. There may be great and grave gaps in his creed. The restored blind man did not know whether Jesus was a sinner or not; that surely was a serious defect in his knowledge. But he could affirm: "One thing I know," and that one thing followed out in obedience led him on until he exclaimed: "Lord, I believe. And he worshipped him."

The sinner at conversion may have equally serious defects in his faith; but if he follows the light he has it will lead him into clearer knowledge of and fuller faith in Christ. In the hour of conversion the sinner should not be urged or asked to believe everything or to believe too much; more than he can honestly accept and obey. One may try to believe too much, more than he can digest, as he can put too much food in his stomach, or too much fuel on a fire. But when one obeys what he does know, he shall find the truth and the truth will set him free.

Conversion, then, is not an arbitrary act and does not violate the supreme law of truth and duty; but

it is an act of the whole mind in which the will can select its object and fix its attention upon it until it grows into power, and it makes the object of its ethical faith and life by casting its own deciding vote for it and by obedience turning faith into fact. On these grounds we can appeal to the sinner to exercise this liberty and responsibility and power in believing religious truth and turning from sin unto God.

PITTSBURGH, PENNSYLVANIA.

NEW MATERIALS FOR NEW TESTAMENT STUDY

By REV. PROFESSOR JAMES HOPE MOULTON, D. D., D. C. L., D. Lit.,
Manchester University and Didsbury Theological College, England

THERE are few more thought-provoking sights, for one who tries to estimate the place of the Bible in human life, than that of a great library in the section devoted to religion. I have before my mind's eye the largest room in the university library at Cambridge, my own *alma mater*. There we may see an immense collection of books about religion, and the great mass of them directly concerned with the little volume which I may carry in my pocket. I take out that little book in the midst of this great assemblage of ancillary literature. I remember that the central parts of it, the Gospels, speak now in some seven hundred languages to mankind. How strange it seems in this library to reflect that faint-hearted friends or cocksure foes should think it worth while to discuss whether the Book has had its day!

Just look at the trayful of new books waiting to claim their places on those crowded shelves. Learned men have spent long years of study to write, say, a five thousandth commentary on one of Paul's shorter epistles. There is a new English translation which tries to put the meaning freshly so that we may get a less encumbered view—and scores and scores of equally patient workmen have tried the same task before. There are sermons by the ton which have applied single sentences of that Book to the practical needs of their day. There are systems of theology

which have elaborated the simplicity of religion as found there. There are lexicons and grammars and archaeologies and histories and literary criticism and examinations of textual tradition. Yes, and there are acute and brilliant researches which undermine every claim that the church has ever made, emancipating humanity in triumph from a bondage too long and too patiently endured. We need go no further than this last class to find proof that somehow this little Book stands out from all others as much as it ever did, that predictions of its disappearance to the top shelf will only share the fate of similar predictions uttered at frequent intervals for many a long year.

But all this is a well-worn theme, though one that a good many "fearful saints" might take up to their great comfort when their hearts are a-tremble for the mark of God. The Bible is not going to lose its place because modern scholarship rightly insists on bringing its interpretation into line with present knowledge. If "criticism" were the dark and dangerous thing some good people think it to be, the Bible would be simply not worth studying. Reverent modern thinkers believe in it just because its value is independent of all that growth of knowledge can affect; it stands deep-founded on those great rock-truths which were the same for Moses as for Milton, for primeval savages and for the highest representatives of twentieth century culture.

The fact is that the service of knowledge is a perpetually growing amazement to lovers of the Bible who know, and are not afraid of knowledge. Those serried ranks of books, coming from the best brains and the warmest hearts in the world through two thousand years, have surely said all there is to be said

about the Bible! In such a well worked field there is nothing new under the sun. Not so. No earnest and intelligent disciple can work long in that inexhaustible mine without bringing up something new. Every generation has its genuine novelties to add. Changing circumstance and growing knowledge have new expositions of the Book of the human heart, which is also a triumph of the human mind. (*Human mind*, I say, for God made and equipped that mind for the highest service it was to render.) So it is that the toll of all the ages comes to humble souls who seek their treasure there.

I propose to say a few words about a new contribution made by our own generation to the study of the New Testament. The last four centuries in the West have been continually enlarging our knowledge of Greek, the wonderful language in which the Bible first spoke to the Gentile world. Till very lately, scholars have sought the meaning of apostles' and evangelists' language by applying the rapidly growing stores of information collected by students of the great literature of Greece. It has been imperfectly taken into account that this literature came to an end, as a product of a living idiom, four centuries before the New Testament was written. Poets and prose writers still continued to write, but no one ever spoke in familiar intercourse the Greek that was used in books. It is only necessary to state this fact for us to deduce the risks we run when we depend on classical Greek to tell us what words meant, or grammatical constructions implied, in the Greek of the first century A.D.

There is an English poem, about as old for us as Sophocles was for Paul, in which the child Jesus is called a "silly knave," which then meant "holy boy."

Imagine a foreigner, learned in the English of the fourteenth century, trying to interpret a new novel on the strength of such knowledge, unadulterated with knowledge of modern English! We are not in quite so bad a case as that, of course, for we have a continuous tradition of Biblical interpretation, starting from the second century, and embodied in early versions which had little connection with the lore of archaistic and artificial Greek. But our commentators not seldom betray the mischievous consequences of knowing too much classics! There is a conjunction which in classical Greek introduced sentences of purpose, "in order that." In the spoken Greek of to-day it makes a periphrasis for the obsolete infinitive, in all its senses. And, as in many other cases, students of New Testament Greek would have done better to study the patois of a modern peasant than to fix exclusive attention on the literature of the Golden Age. What desperate tortures excellent commentators have inflicted on many a passage in order to force a sense of purpose upon a phrase where it was no longer at home! Or let us take stray examples from the vocabulary. An adjective is applied to Apollos, which in earlier Greek meant *learned* (especially in history), but later came to mean *eloquent*. A noun that once meant *stake* or *pole* came down to be a *splinter* or *thorn* when Paul was suffering from his "thorn in the flesh." In the latter case the British Revisers of 1881 have placed in a scrupulous margin the fact—which is no fact—that the Greek was *stake*. In the former case they put *learned* in the text. They were much too good classical scholars, that is all!

But they had an excellent excuse, after all. One of the greatest of them, Bishop J. B. Lightfoot, told

his Cambridge students in 1863 that if only we could get hold of the private letters of ordinary people, living in the age of the New Testament, they would be of the highest value for the study of the Greek Bible. Strange to say, there were at the time he said this not a few such letters already published, as in a collection of miscellaneous Egyptian documents issued by the British Museum. But it does not seem to have occurred to anybody to examine them. And in the absence of such we must remember that practically we had no materials for reconstructing the real language of daily life in the first century A.D. It was never used in literature. The writer of books would have thought it simply shocking to drop into the style everybody used for conversation; it was beneath the dignity of *belles lettres*. And what hope can we have of recalling a mode of speech that is past if it has not enshrined itself in books that can live?

And here came in the Egyptian explorer. I am writing these notes on the Red Sea, on my way to a year's work for the Young Men's Christian Association in India. Fresh from my first sight of the desert, I can understand vividly enough how in the last quarter of a century new treasures of Egypt have come forth to reward patient search. In old times the easiest way to get rid of waste paper was to dump it down on the sand outside a town, where very quickly it was covered up by the wind that blew the dry sand along. And as in Egypt it hardly ever rains—I should have said never, had I not myself landed at Port Said in a shower—and what rain there is wets only the top inches at most, the waste paper was preserved to all time so that it looks to-day much as when it was written. The paper, or

papyrus, was made of the pith of the papyrus reed, cut in strips, laid transversely upon another layer with gum, and then pressed and dried. The Egypt Exploration Society set itself to collect this ancient waste paper, through the brilliant labor of its chief explorers in this field, Drs. Grenfell and Hunt. Other scholars, from America, France, Italy, and Germany, were soon rivalling their output, and it was seen that a new and unsuspected field was open to the lover of Greek. There were not a few prizes of a familiar kind, though novelties themselves—new Greek poets, new chroniclers, new works by known writers. And among them were documents of interest to theologians—new Biblical manuscripts, fragmentary enough, new pieces of Fathers, and, beyond all others interesting, the two precious scraps containing sayings of Jesus, some of which have a strong claim to be regarded as authentic.

But the real value of these new finds, which have been accumulating at a great rate since about 1890, was of another order altogether. The mass of these papyri, which date from B.C. 311 down to the seventh or eighth century after Christ, and can most of them be assigned to precise dates, consists of writings whose place in the waste-paper receptacle is altogether easy to account for—old letters, petitions, accounts, legal proceedings, government orders, etc., etc., all designed for specific purposes of temporary character, and thrown away as soon as they had served those purposes. Such writings were not likely to be composed in stilted and archaic style, like books which were meant for immortality. In the petitions and official documents there is a great deal of repetition of formulæ. Private letters, especially those of uneducated persons, are free from suspicion of artificiality, and obviously present

us with their writer's ordinary style of speech. We have accordingly recovered in these papers a large variety of genuine examples of the vernacular Greek of Egypt in the times when they were severally written.

These writings have opened the door to our recognition of many other specimens of the vernacular. A great many inscriptions from various sources are soon found to tally in marked characteristics, and give us specimens of vernacular from other countries. We have also a large number of notes by archaizing purists, who tell us what the Attic speakers say and warn against the depraved words and inflections current in popular speech. And finally we have the evidence of Modern Greek vernacular, which can be shown to stand in the direct succession of the popular Greek of the first century.

From these sources we can reconstruct the Greek which was the universal speech binding together all parts of the Roman Empire in its earlier days. Its extent is really wonderful. In Rome, in Spain, in Africa and Egypt, in Asia Minor and right through to the very frontiers of India, this imperial language was everywhere spoken, so that the first missionaries of Christianity had no new language to learn, but could go in all directions and preach at once with no doubt that they would be understood.

The new discovery, by promising to set forth which I began, relates to the bearing of all this on the language of the New Testament itself. It had long been a commonplace that the Greek of the sacred book was something quite to itself. No parallel was ever found for it. The most effective foil to it is the Greek of Josephus. A Jew of the first century, whose original

language was Aramaic, Josephus might be expected to write essentially the same Greek as Paul. Nothing could be more unlike. Why should they differ? Part of the answer is clear enough. Josephus could not possibly be writing as he talked; his style is literary, archaizing, artificial to the last degree. Is, then, Paul writing simply the colloquial idiom? After what has been said it will be natural to guess that the answer is affirmative.

It is thanks to the papyri that this conclusion has become fairly certain. A young German pastor, Adolf Deissmann, was browsing in a library rather more than twenty years ago. He casually picked up a book of newly published Greek papyri from Egypt, and turning the pages found one which was signed by a friend of his who had deciphered the document. The personal interest led him to read it, and as he read the thought flashed on him: "Why, this is just the Greek of the New Testament." Out of that simple but profoundly important idea came two unpretentious little books, *Bibelstudien* (1895) and *Neue Bibelstudien* (1897), which were immediately recognized as revolutionizing a whole science. Deissmann is now professor at Berlin—a dear friend of my own still, though severed by the appalling gulf of this world war. His books are almost all translated into English and show a fascinating style and a human interest not often found in a German writer. He has fairly established his central thesis, which has been reinforced from the side of grammar and is now being systematized by detailed comparison of the vocabulary of these popular sources with that of the sacred writers.

There are of course peculiar features; every writing on a special subject must have its own technical terms

and phraseology to some extent distinct from that found elsewhere. In particular we have reflections from foreign idioms which leave appreciable traces. The Greek Old Testament was translated often in a clumsy literal style, which made its phrases frequently not Greek at all; and the queer phrases, like some of those in our English Bible, passed into the thought of men brought up on it till they repeated and even imitated them freely. Moreover, in the Synoptic Gospels especially there were many narratives and discourses which had been roughly rendered out of an original Aramaic by people of little Greek education. But when these alien elements are allowed for, we find that the bulk of New Testament Greek is just nothing but the colloquial Greek which was in use all over the then known world, and practically without variation. It is a most suggestive result.

The Book of books proves to have been from the first a book so written as to reach the largest possible number of simple people. Others might deal in the airs and graces of the approved literary style. A man like Paul could have Atticized with the best of them, could have used long and erudite words which men of his own culture would understand. He would not, for the simple style would be understood by high and low, cultured and ignorant alike, and he must by all means win some. It is a fitting start for the career of a Book which has spoken to millions where any other book in the world has reached its hundreds. Are we not justified in claiming that our new materials add yet another chapter to the long tale of evidences that prove from so many different sides that no other book in all literature speaks like this one?

COLLATERAL READINGS ON THE INTERNATIONAL SUNDAY SCHOOL LESSONS¹

August 6. The Greatest Thing in the World. 1 Corinthians 13.

1. The divine source of love (Exodus 20:6; Deuteronomy 7:6-11; Psalm 103; 1 John 4:16).
2. Love and law (Matthew 22:35-40). Read also Job 31:16-22; Leviticus 19:17, 18; Romans 13:8-10.
3. Love's expression and proof (Romans 5:1-11). Compare John 13:34, 35; 15:12, 13.

August 13. The Grace of Giving. 2 Corinthians 9.

1. Giving in the Old Testament (Leviticus 25:35-40; Exodus 35:21-29; Deuteronomy 16:10, 17—the essential principle of religious giving; Malachi 3:7-10).
2. The judgment of Jesus on gifts and giving (Luke 21:1-4).
3. Giving in the early church (Acts 4:32-37; 11:27-30, and references).

August 20. The Riot at Ephesus. Acts 19:23-41.

1. Paul's first visit to Ephesus (second missionary journey) (Acts 18:19-21; Ephesians 1:1, 2).

¹In this series, for obvious reasons, the usual custom of giving Bible readings only has been departed from in a few instances.

2. Shrines—small models of temple. For method of manufacturing shrines and images, see Isaiah 40:18-20. Compare Numbers 33:52; Hosea 13:2.
3. Paul's experience of riots. See Acts 13:50; 14:19; 17:5-9; 21:27-36; 22:22-29.

August 27. Journeying to Jerusalem. Acts 20:16-38.

1. The journey to Jerusalem begins at Corinth (Acts 20:3), where Paul spent three months.
 - a. The changed plan (v. 3). See maps.
 - b. The return journey. Corinth to Berea, Thessalonica, Amphipolis, and Philippi, thence to Troas (vs. 4-6).
 - c. Luke joins the party (vs. 5, 6).
 - d. From Troas to Miletus (vs. 13-15). Note Paul's plan (v. 16).
 - e. The conference at Miletus (the lesson, 16-38).
 - f. The journey to Syria; Cos, Rhodes, Patara (in Lycia), Tyre, Ptolemais, Cæsarea, and Jerusalem (21:1-16). It will be noted that this lesson is an episode in the journey from Corinth to Jerusalem on the third missionary journey.

September 3. Paul's Sorrows and Comforts. 2 Corinthians 11:21-12:10.

1. Circumstances of the second Corinthian letter.

- a. Paul did not meet Titus at Troas (2 Corinthians 2:13) but in Macedonia, probably at Philippi (Acts 20:1). From this point the letter was written.
- b. It was written to vindicate Paul's change of plan with reference to visiting Corinth. Compare 1 Corinthians 16:5-9 and 2 Corinthians 1:15-2:11.
- c. It was written also to commend the church for its action on the local case of discipline which had aroused so much controversial feeling. Compare 2 Corinthians 2:5-11 and 1 Corinthians 5:1-8.

2. Paul's sufferings.

- a. Plots (Acts 20:3; 9:23-25; 23:12, 30).
- b. Imprisonments. See Acts 16:19-34, and read Genesis 39:7-23, with references in later epistles. Most of these experiences are not mentioned by Luke. (See Denney, Expositor's Bible, Second Corinthians, p. 339.)
- c. Paul's compensating joys and privileges (12:1-6; 7-10). Read Psalm 103 and Revelation 7:13-17.

September 10. The Arrest of Paul. Acts 21:17-40.

1. Paul as a Nazarite. See Numbers 6:13-18; 1 Corinthians 9:15-26; International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, 2285f; Ramsay, St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen, p. 310.

2. The charge of defiling the temple. See 20:4, and compare with other charges brought against the Apostle—e. g., 16:20, 21; 18:12, 13; 19:23-34; 24:2-9.
3. The attitude of the Roman official (vs. 31-40). Read above passages (under 2) and 16:22-24; 19:35-41; 24:10, 22, 23; 25:1-5, 13-16, 24-27; 26:24-32.

September 17. The Prisoner in the Castle. Acts 22.

1. Paul speaks in Hebrew. See 26:1 and 23:1f.
2. Paul's defense. For comparison read 9:1-9; 26:2-23; Deuteronomy 5:22-27.
3. For part of the Roman officers in this incident see Ramsay, *St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen*, pp. 303f, and for closing events in general, Stokes, *Expositor's Bible, Acts*, vol. 2, pp. 422f.

September 24. Review: The Things Which Are Not Seen. Reading Lesson: 2 Corinthians 4:1-5:4. Read for comparison Matthew 6:19-24; Hebrews 11:1, 27; 1 Peter 1:3-9; 2 Peter 1:12-21; 1 John 1:1-10; Revelation 1:8-20.

October 1. A Plot That Failed. Acts 23.

1. Paul and the High Priest. For explanation of this incident see Ramsay, *The Bearing of Recent Discovery on the Trustworthiness of the New Testament*, pp. 90ff.

2. Paul and the Jewish parties. Read Matthew 22:23-33.
3. The plot. Read 9:23-25. Note the action of the Roman officials in view of the plot. See Ramsay, St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen, ch. 14.

October 8. Paul Before Felix. Acts 24.

1. Felix (Antonius). See Bible dictionaries and commentaries, especially International Standard Bible Encyclopedia, art. Felix; also Ramsay, St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen, p. 313.
2. Paul's defense. For summary of accusations, see Stokes, Expositor's Bible, Acts, pp. 430-432. Review the other defenses of Paul as above.

October 15. The Appeal to Cæsar. Acts 25.

1. Paul's Roman citizenship. See Acts 16:21, 37, 38; 22:24-29; 23:27; 25:16, and read Ramsay, St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen, ch. 2.
2. Porcius Festus. See dictionaries.
3. The meaning of this appeal. See Romans 1:8-15; Colossians 4:10-17; Philippians 1:1-3. Paul's desire to go to Rome is fulfilled, but he goes as a prisoner in chains.

October 22. Paul's Defense Before Agrippa. Acts 26.

1. Agrippa (Herod II). See articles.

2. Paul's defense. Review Paul's different accounts of his conversion.

October 29. The Voyage. Acts 27:1-38. (Read to 28:15.) On this interesting chapter wide reading is possible and advisable. The following chapters and articles are suggested: Ramsay, St. Paul, the Traveler and Roman Citizen, ch. 15; Smith, Voyage and Shipwreck of St. Paul; Robertson, Epochs in the Life of Paul.

LITERARY REVIEWS

[Authors and publishers are requested not to send either books, periodicals or pamphlets for review. The editors prefer to select and purchase whatever is to be reviewed in these pages. —EDITORS.]

DR. WARD'S WHAT I BELIEVE AND WHY¹

IN THIS book we have what might be called a liberal theologian's creed. The "what" he believes might be put into a very small compass. His creed *per se* is a brief one. It is the "why" he believes what little he does that occupies by far the major part of the book.

The merits of the book will first be dealt with. It is written in an engaging style; one might, in fact, say a gripping style. Its literary merit is of a high order and has what could be termed real distinction. So far as we can recall there is not a poorly or obscurely constructed sentence in the entire volume. Even where the author deals with scientific matters and must needs use some technical terminology, his literary art is so perfect that any person possessed of ordinary scientific knowledge can understand and follow him with delight.

The book is instructive, particularly so regarding the latest speculations of science. Thus after reading and digesting the contents of the volume one has a sort of "up-to-date" feeling. Another merit is that the author is a "realist" in philosophy and therefore also a "dualist." He has not lost himself in the cloud-land of idealism nor in the bogland of materialism. To him the I, the *ego*, is an actual entity that thinks and experiences and that is to be differentiated from the other quiddity of the cosmos, namely, material substance. He believes no less sturdily in the objective reality of the outer world—that is, that there must be actual *noumena* as the basis of the *phenomena* that impinge on the

¹What I Believe and Why, by William Hayes Ward. New York, 1915. Pp. 333.

human consciousness. Our author, we are glad to say, is no solipsist.

A decidedly meritorious feature of the book is its cogent, if not wholly convincing, arguments for theism. Beginning with the conceptions of time and space, then continuing with ether, matter, and mind, and on to the universe as a whole, an examination of the cosmos leads the author to believe in God, who undoubtedly is the Creator and Preserver of all finite things. He accepts the legitimacy of the teleological argument, and presents it in a fresh, original, and astute form, and thus sets himself in opposition to Kant's criticisms and doubts and the labored and winding rational processes of the whole school of naturalistic evolutionists. At the close of each chapter from IV to XII he draws the conclusion that the presentation points convincingly to the divine existence. Thus we can say that Dr. Ward, by means of an examination of the physical cosmos, reaches a fairly sure theistic conclusion, though he is not so sure as to be dogmatic even in asserting that there is a God.

We now turn—and we confess with a feeling of sadness—to what we must regard as some of the serious defects of the book. First, let us survey the work as a whole. All summed up, what is the author's creed? It is this: 1. I Believe in God, though I am not sure of His existence; 2. I believe in a historic Christ, though I have no positive view of His person—that is, whether He was the God-man or only a God-filled man, and it does not matter to me which He was; 3. I believe in a future life, but cannot be absolutely sure; 4. Whether God exists or not, whether Christ ever existed or not, whether there is a future life or not, one thing I am sure of—goodness and love are the only essential things.

This surely is a very much pared-down creed, and yet the author calls his creed Christian; not only so, but the "essence" of Christianity. His creed is even more meager than it looks to be from the above statement, for the only kind of love that is essential is love to one's fellowmen, not love to God or to Christ.

Thus even on the doctrine of love, Christ and Dr. Ward differ radically; for Dr. Ward contends that the one all-important matter is love to man, while Christ asserted that "the great and first commandment" is to love God with all one's might, heart,

and strength; then the second, love to neighbor, is "like unto it." However, it is a small matter with our author to convict him of differing from Christ, for he would simply asseverate that Christ has been misreported when He declares that love to God is the great and first commandment. You see, when a man is a rationalist instead of an evangelical believer, it does no good to quote the Bible to him because he simply denies that the Bible is inspired of God. At all events, whatever does not agree with his rational processes does not come from God.

This leads us to the *gravamen* of Dr. Ward's book and the *raison d'être* of his meager credal belief. His whole scheme of thought is rationalistic, hence, to speak plainly, it is non-Christian, not to say anti-Christian. To show that we have not misrepresented him we refer the reader, first, to the whole book, which everywhere insists that the rational processes alone have validity and authority. Second, we refer to specific statements. On page 203 we read: "Just as our belief in God must rest on good, rational evidence, so all our religious beliefs which depend upon it must be supported by evidence. Reason is always arbiter. * * * To my own master, God, and to him alone, I stand or fall. In matters of morals, as well as of fact, I must stand on my own conscience, no matter what the church says, or what the law says, or what the Bible says, or what I am told anywhere or by anybody what God says. I will search and get evidence from all these (sources) and from every source, but in the end my best decision is final and supreme; and so is every man's." On page 155 there is just as assertive and even a more defiant statement.

These oracular pronouncements are not characterized by any marked degree of humility, nor do they seem to recognize the sad limitations of human knowledge and reason. Human reason has made so many serious and fatal blunders in the past that it would certainly be becoming to speak more modestly of its acumen. Besides, we remark that the statement quoted above lacks psychological precision. In one sentence "reason" is made the arbiter; in a subsequent sentence that function is assigned to "conscience." It is a confusion of thought thus to identify two distinct psychical faculties or powers.

At this point it is competent to show that the rationalistic temper is anti-Biblical, hence anti-Christian. Since the Bible is

the literary basis of Christianity and the only source from which its doctrines are derived, we do not hesitate to say that whatever undermines the informing, regulative, fundamental principles of Biblical teaching is, and must needs be, the opposite of the true "essence" of Christianity. Now, while the Bible often speaks of reason and gives it a proper place in the conduct of human thought and life, it never makes human reason the sole and ultimate court of appeal. Christ Himself gave a higher place to repentance and faith than to reason. At the beginning of His ministry He cried, saying: "The kingdom of God is at hand; repent ye, and believe in the gospel." Again He said that whosoever believeth on Him should not perish, but have everlasting life. And again: "He that believeth and is baptized shall be saved; but he that disbelieveth shall be condemned." Also: "Let not your heart be troubled: believe in God, believe also in me." Christ never gave the primacy to human reason. He assigned a much higher and more determining place to experience. Note John 7:17: "If any man willeth to do his will, he shall know of the teaching, whether it is of God, or whether I speak from myself." John 8:31: "If ye abide in my word, then are ye truly my disciples; and ye shall know the truth, and the truth shall make you free." Dr. Ward has little to say about faith, and he casts odium on Christian experience (see his chapter on The Direct Vision of God); therefore his doctrines differ diametrically from those of Christ as recorded in the Gospels. Nor is the apostolic teaching different from that of Christ. The keynote of Paul's theology is: Justified by faith, saved by grace. Dr. Ward has not in his book one word to say on these great New Testament *loci*, not a word about justification by faith and salvation by grace.

We are simply showing here how far Dr. Ward has wandered from the Biblical foundations by his rationalizing processes. Of course, he would retort: You are taking the Bible for granted; whereas the truth of the Bible is the very thing to be proved; you are begging the question. Yes, but that very retort would prove our contention, namely, that Dr. Ward has undermined the historical and doctrinal foundations of the Christian system, which are found nowhere if they are not found in the sacred Scriptures. By his own admission (page 203) it is not the Bible, but his own reason, which is the final norm in matters of religion. Worst

of all, the mere fragments of the Bible which he does accept are accepted only because they agree with rationalizing methods and conclusions, not in the least because they are taught in the Bible.

Dr. Ward's religion is the religion of reason, not of revelation. Therefore it is the religion of intellectual aristocracy, good only for the academic *elite* who have the time and capacity for all these labored processes of thought and investigation. It is not a religion for the common man, and for the world lying in sin and overborne with sorrow. As we followed the author through all his logical processes we could not help thanking God again and again that there is, through God's grace and mercy, a shorter and surer way to the assurance of pardon, truth, and salvation, a way that is so plain that the wayfaring man, though a fool, need not err therein. We are disposed to think that the good and loving heavenly Father would, if He revealed a plan of salvation, reveal one that was democratic rather than aristocratic. Therefore we prefer the religion of the old Bible to the modern doctrinaire affair.

In some respects the credulity of the rationalists is proverbial. Extremely skeptical and bristling toward the Bible, it is wonderful how ready they are to accept the speculations of science. Dr. Ward is a case in point. He believes what scientific speculation says about the universal ether, vortices, electrons, atoms, and molecules, and all their combinations into the various palpable and ponderable material substances. We confess that we, too, incline very much to believe in the ether-atom theory of matter; yet every informed person knows that it is only a scientific hypothesis, far from being actually proved, and that it imposes almost insuperable difficulties on the faith faculty. Note the rationalist's credulity. He accepts the universal ether hypothesis without question; yet see the difficulties. Science says that the primordial ether is a perfectly continuous, atomless, ductile, pliant, elastic substance. How can that be? How can there be matter that is not made up of parts or particles? What holds it together in perfect continuity? How can such a fine, extremely tenuous substance be absolutely elastic, so that it can be stretched indefinitely without breaking? Then, it is said to be so attenuated that the earth, with its volatile atmosphere, swings through it in its orbit with inconceivable velocity without causing enough

friction to retard the globe one second in a millennium, and even, too, without scaling off or affecting the earth's atmosphere! How can these things be? And how could whorls, or vortices, form electrons, and electrons be converted into atoms? What are atoms, anyway? And if the ether is imponderable, how can ponderable substances be formed out of it by means of whorls? If it is in the least ponderable, there is the difficulty again of the earth in its swift passage slipping through it without friction. This wonderful essence, so subtle and intangible, is also made to do duty in the rôle of gravitation, so that it holds all the swinging planets and stars in their orbits. How utterly mysterious it all is! How few difficulties are explained by this hypothesis, after all! To our mind, the Biblical miracles and the doctrines of the Trinity, the virgin birth of our Lord, and the incarnation of the Logos are easier to believe than is this scientific guesswork about the "ether of space." Yet Dr. Ward simply bolts the ether without question. However, when he comes to the Biblical statements he balks at once, his "reason" revolts, and he grows polemical.

In chapter XIII the author deals with the question of religious experience, and, we regret to say, he not only disparages it but seeks to pour scorn upon it. He declares (page 153) that he has never had such an experience. This is a delicate matter, and the author should not have tried to discredit such a sacred matter as experience in religion. To be as mild and gentle as possible, let us say, his confessed lack of experience and his apparent repugnance toward it may be the key to his whole attitude toward the chief Christian verities. If a man cannot say with Paul: "The Spirit himself beareth witness with our spirit, that we are children of God," you can hardly expect him to deal adequately with a book that is pre-eminently spiritual. Our Lord said clearly: "Except one is born anew, he cannot see the kingdom of God," and, "That which is born of the flesh is flesh; and that which is born of the Spirit is spirit." And Paul says that spiritual things are spiritually judged.

Unspiritual as the book is, the author's reasoning on ethical *loci* is scarcely less defective, spite of the fact that he makes "reason" the final arbiter. On page 299 we find this: "And goodness is the only essential thing, not any belief, whether in immortality or in God himself." Again on the same page: "To

love others and to sacrifice or even die for them is right; is beautiful; and the obligations of character do not rest on the will or even on the existence of God, but on essential righteousness."

We fear that here is a serious *lacuna* in this reasoning. One of the profoundest problems of ethics is the ultimate ground of right. Could right have its ultimate ground in mere material substance? Can you predicate right and wrong, or morality, of mere things? How could the moral ever have evolved out of the non-moral? Does not moral quality pertain only to rational personalities? Therefore back of all the moral phenomena of the world, as their source and basis, there must be a rational Person. Hence the author's logic and ethics are alike unsound. Eliminate God, and you destroy the very foundation of moral distinctions.

Our proponent of reason as the sole guide also trips seriously on pages 302 and 303. "Ethics," he says, "is a bigger word than religion, for it includes it. If ethics is the science of duty, it embraces all duties to all beings under all relations. But that part of duty which relates to God we call *religion*. Religion, then, is a subdivision, a large subdivision, under ethics."

This is an utter subversion of the Christian doctrine of religion and ethics. In the Christian system all duties are a vital part of religion. Duties to men are also duties to God. Anyone who knows the Bible at all ought to be able to see this. When Cain killed Abel God called the murderer to account, saying: "The voice of thy brother's blood crieth unto me from the ground." Jesus said: "Inasmuch as ye did it unto one of these my brethren, even these least, ye did it unto me." Corban would not be accepted of God in lieu of honoring parents. Salvation itself is an ethical recovery—from sin to righteousness. In the Christian system spirituality and morality go hand in hand. God hath joined them together; let not the rationalists tear them asunder. Being proponents of reason, they ought to reason discerningly enough to learn to distinguish without separating. To divorce spirituality and morality is to depart from the Christian foundation and shift over upon a pagan basis.

The author's "reason" is also at fault when he tries to separate the spheres of truth and duty (pages 301, 302). They cover the same ground. Wherever there is truth there is also duty, and *vice versa*. No sane man will recognize a duty unless

he sees that it is based upon truth, and no true man sees truth without at the same time recognizing his duty to it. The author's confusion arises from the fact that he identifies belief and truth. But even then a man would not perform an obligation unless he believed that it lay in the field of truth.

Perhaps the author's hazy view of ethics accounts for the fact that he entirely omits the moral argument for the divine existence. He seems to be favorably impressed with the teleological and cosmological arguments. But, after all, the moral argument requires a higher type of thought than do the other arguments, which deal mostly with material things.

Thus we might point out flaw after flaw in the reasoning of the book, showing that rationalists are not always experts in their own line; but we must forbear, on account of the limits of space. The author's treatment of the Bible and of Biblical inspiration is simply slashing; we are tempted to say, iconoclastic. Space will not permit dealing with it here.

A closing word respecting Dr. Ward's aplomb. So far as he is concerned, the great, erudite, and convincing apologetic works of evangelical scholars are all as if they were not. He either knows nothing about them, or ignores them. The divine inspiration of the Holy Scriptures is tossed aside as lightly as if Keil, Delitzsch, Ebrard, Christlieb, Cave, Orr, Urquhart, Green, McGarvey, and Fisher had never lived, wrought, and written. Spite of the monumental works of Judge Lamb and Dr. Mead the author rejects the Biblical miracles (except one) at a fell swoop. There are the truly great books of James Orr on *The Virgin Birth of Christ* and of Louis Matthews Sweet on *The Birth and Infancy of Jesus Christ*, but Dr. Ward ignores them, and dismisses the doctrine of our Lord's miraculous conception with a few lines. All unaware, apparently, of Stearns' *The Evidence of Christian Experience*, and Mullins' *Why Is Christianity True?* this author even tries to laugh "the direct vision of God" out of court. We are constrained to add this reflection: To emasculate Christianity, and still insist on calling it Christianity, is worse than illogical. One might well ask in all seriousness: Is it ethical?

LEANDER S. KEYSER.

THE WORKS OF THE LATE DR. BETTEX²

RECENTLY new American editions of the works of Professor Friedrich Bettex, who died in retirement last September, have been called to our attention. This appearance of a fuller translation of Dr. Bettex's valued German works leads us to suggest to our readers a religious writer of unusual significance and value. Professor Bettex was a native of French Switzerland. During the most active years of his life he was a professor in a Hochschule for girls at Stuttgart. He was a preacher of rare power and an influential writer on many phases of Christian apologetics.

The following is not, strictly speaking, a book review, inasmuch as it covers the whole work of this distinguished teacher of the church so far as it is available in English. We have before us ten publications of varying dates up to the present year, eight pamphlets, and two considerable volumes. To a certain extent the pamphlets are individual discourses dealing with themes discussed at length in the two chief volumes, *The Bible the Word of God*, and *Science and Christianity*. There are, however, among the pamphlets noted below several independent and powerful addresses on themes quite apart from the discussions in the larger books. It is by means of these productions that we are desirous of introducing through these pages Dr. Bettex, who deservedly enjoyed an extraordinary popularity in Germany and among Lutherans in America, but, if we do not mistake, is comparatively unknown to other American Christians.

The work of Dr. Bettex exhibits a combination of qualities usually considered psychologically incompatible within the compass of one man's thought and expression. He is at once (judged by his productions) a laborious student, patient in the infinite

²The works of Dr. Bettex here reviewed are:

The Miracle, Burlington, Iowa, 1900. Pp. 78.

Science and Christianity, London, 1901. Pp. 326.

The Bible the Word of God, London and New York, 1904. Pp. 316.

What Think Ye of Christ? Burlington, Iowa, 1907. Pp. 102.

The First Page of the Bible, Burlington, Iowa, 1908. Pp. 89.

The Bible and Modern Criticism, Burlington, Iowa, 1911. Pp. 33.

The Word of Truth, Burlington, Iowa, 1914. Pp. 113.

The Glory of the Triune God, Burlington, Iowa, 1914. Pp. 78.

The Hunger of Israel, Burlington, Iowa, 1915. Pp. 37.

The Six Days of Creation, in the Light of Modern Science, Burlington, Iowa, 1916. Pp. 45.

drudgery of acquiring facts, and a forensic orator possessed of a powerful and creative imagination. He is at once a thinker and a word painter. He is at the same time learned and popular. He is both profound and lucid. But most striking of all, as we ordinarily look at things, he is at one and the same time thoroughly *modern*, an easy master of contemporary scientific facts and speculations, and a most uncompromising advocate of orthodox and traditional Christianity. Professor Bettex believed in the Trinity (see *The Glory of the Triune God*), in the inspiration and authority of the Bible, even in matters of cosmogonic detail (see *The Bible the Word of God*, *The Word of Truth*, *The First Page of the Bible*, *The Six Days of Creation*), in the Deity of Christ (see *What Think Ye of Christ?*), in miracles (see *The Miracle*). In short, he held to the whole body and substance of traditional belief which is involved in adherence to the Bible and to the historic confessions of the church.

The remarkable fact here is, that, while such beliefs as Dr. Bettex held might be simply traditional and unreasoned, held through habit and due to intellectual inertia and partial-mindedness, they are nothing of the sort. It is also to be emphasized that the orthodoxy of Dr. Bettex is essentially loyalty to Scripture not by any means current or conventional even within the limits of his own ecclesiastical connection. He does not hesitate to depart from formal and confessional regularity in order to be true to Scripture (see *The Glory of the Triune God*, pp. 22, 34, 46—line 4 from the bottom of the page, 50; *The Bible the Word of God*, pp. 297, 298). Dr. Bettex's orthodoxy was thoroughly reasoned and systematic, and most emphatically positive, constructive, and alive. One feels immediately the intensity and flaming earnestness of his convictions. What would be, in one less learned and able as a reasoner, pure dogmatism, is in the case of this great advocate and exponent of historical Christianity a concatenated and buttressed apologetic.

The major religious question of our day for cleric and layman alike is the matter of adjustment to present day conditions, or so-called "theological reconstruction." How much of traditional Christianity are we compelled to give up in order to be thoroughly modern—in moral terms, loyal to the light of our day? No one will deny that the question is important and even vital, and quite

as difficult as important. On the one hand are those who, so to say, self-consciously modern in their thought and feeling, are uninclined to abandon everything that fails to comport with advanced modern speculation as well as discovery. On the other hand many who have discovered deep and satisfying truth in traditional Christianity are almost forced into an attitude of antagonism to modern influences to save the essential truths by which they live. Many young men stand bewildered, at the mercy of these antagonistic tendencies, lacking sufficient knowledge from without or from within to choose wisely and well.

In Professor Bettex we have an essentially modern man, fully informed as to modern discoveries, bold in facing the possibilities of future discoveries, temperamentally interested in science, who yields nothing in his uncompromising traditionalism. Moreover, Dr. Bettex has related his scientific and his religious faiths, bringing each to the test of the other. The result is that he is a scientific student of the Bible and a Biblical student of sciences. He has approached the center from both sides. And in and through all his work in both phases of his expositions, on the scientific and Biblical sides, is evident the unifying and constructive power of an enlightened mind and creative imagination. We have risen from the perusal of these works of Professor Bettex with the deepened conviction that our surrender to the *Zeitgeist* is due rather to the influence of current ideas than to the compelling power of actual facts.

As an intellectual phenomenon, altogether apart from his actual contributions to the discussions of great subjects, Professor Bettex should be carefully studied. He should be known by the convinced or temperamental modernist as a counterpoise to a too facile tendency to surrender traditional positions at the beck of current theories. The modernist is quite too apt to be lamentably ignorant of what can be said on behalf of historic orthodoxy. It is wise to know even that which we reject. The conservative should be familiar with these discussions in order that his convictions may rest upon broader knowledge and that his prejudices against scientific study as such may be removed. Dr. Bettex is himself a demonstration of the thesis which he so often reiterates, that the unbelieving naturalist brings his unbelief to nature, but does not find it there.

The pages before us are full of interesting sentences which invite to generous quotation. A brief selection only can be put before our readers. The positiveness and vigorous assertiveness of Professor Bettex are shown in the following:

"We consider the rejection of the miraculous a sign of mental weakness, and the evasion of the miraculous like the blind faith of the rustic who has been told that beyond the blue hills the earth comes to an end, and believes it. The miracle is our hope and delight. Soon, for what matter a few centuries, we hope to rejoice in the wonderful body of our resurrection and in a world of heavenly miracles when we shall forever contemplate God, the fountain and origin of all miracles."

Pure assertion! says one? Let him read this: "The miracle surrounds us, and only shortsighted persons can deny its existence. The universe and we are here; the question is: where did it come from, and how did we originate? Has a God created the universe? Miracle! Has this universe created itself? Miracle still! Does it exist uncreated from eternity? That too would be an incomprehensible miracle! All origin is miraculous" (The Miracle, p. 13).

"Not only is the origin of the original all a miracle, but the entire Darwinistic theory of evolution is like an ocean of miracles, and few intelligent persons try to conceive what this theory involves" (ibid., p. 14).

Dr. Bettex shares and emphasizes in his own clear and scientific way the Lutheran doctrine of the essential permanence and spiritual worth of the physical world. It is really to this invigorating and harmonizing conception, at any rate in part, that Dr. Bettex's striking combination of science and theology is due. "We repeat that the celestial world is the prototype of the terrestrial. There could be no bodies on earth if there were no bodies in heaven. This is clearly taught in Colossians 1:20. In the world to come the discord between flesh and spirit will revert to its original harmony and perfection" (The Glory of the Triune God, p. 75). We have reserved for special and final mention, with one or two quotations, what we consider the masterpiece of this erudite and brilliant teacher, Science and Christianity. Here quotable sentences leap at us from the pages.

"It is time that a believing theology should set itself the task of giving to the masses a conception of nature founded both on the words of the Creator and the facts of creation, a task more profitable than arguing with those who boast of their unbelief; for the spiritual death from which such negations spring cannot be conquered by refutations and counter proofs, but only by spirit and life. Shall the son of the house understand less of what his Father does than the stranger?" (p. 111).

"There is this peculiarity about the obstinate (physical) fact that, as there is none in itself either good or bad, there is none either religious or irreligious" (p. 117; see what follows, p. 119ff., on Darwinism).

"Because deep in the human soul is inscribed the commandment, 'Thou shalt worship,' materialism sets up a dead god in the place of the living God of the Bible, and says, 'I believe in eternal matter, from which all forces proceed, which has of itself created all things, which knows nothing and yet comprises in itself all knowledge'" (p. 262; read entire section for fine criticism of materialistic dogma).

The conclusion of the whole discussion is this: "The Christian does not believe in opposition to science and in spite of science, but he believes, in consequence of the knowledge, that the science of faith better explains the past and present order of things, and is, for that reason, truer and more scientific than the science of unbelief" (p. 326).

LOUIS MATTHEWS SWEET.

A CONTRIBUTION TO THE HISTORY OF HYMNOLOGY¹

DR. BENSON'S book is an elaboration of a series of lectures delivered at Princeton Theological Seminary in February, 1910, under the title, *The Hymnody of the English-speaking Churches*. These lectures, "reconstructed and rewritten to a larger scale," were subsequently printed in *The Princeton Theological Review*; and now, "once more revised and partly rewritten," they are given to the world in permanent form in this book, *The English*

¹The English Hymn, by Louis F. Benson, D. D. New York, 1915. Pp. 624.

Hymn, Its Development and Use. It was the present reviewer's good fortune to be in Princeton during the winter of 1910, and to hear these lectures delivered; and it is now a great pleasure, after a careful study of the published volume, to express renewed appreciation of Dr. Benson's valuable contribution to the history of hymnology.

Perhaps the most outstanding characteristic of this book is its consistent adherence to the historical method, both in the arrangement and in the treatment of its materials. This is the avowed intention of the author; and, as he himself says in the Preface (p. IX): "This point of view is sedulously maintained." This does not signify merely an adoption of a chronological arrangement; it is something far more fundamental and scientific. It is an endeavor to find the reflection of the spirit and genius of an historical period or movement in the hymns which the people were at that time singing. The chapter titles concretely testify to this method. After two introductory chapters, entitled: The Evolution of the English Hymn and The Liturgical Use of English Hymns, and two chapters on Dr. Watts' Renovation of Psalmody, our author treats in succession: The Methodist Revival, The Evangelical Revival, The Romantic Movement, The Oxford Revival, and Twentieth Century Hymnody. Thus, in a certain sense, one of the advertising encomiums which the publishers put forth in regard to the book is justified: "The volume is in reality a history of the church from the sixteenth century up to the present day. During this period the hymn has exercised a pervasive influence over Christian life and thought and has inspired all the progressive activities of Christianity."

Another characteristic of the book, and one which is not always to be found in writings on hymnology, is its scholarly quality. Dr. Benson is a scholar, and genuine scholarship marks his work throughout the entire volume. This might be evidenced in many ways. One is impressed with his thoroughness. In the Preface he says: "Our special concern is to follow down the main stream of Hymnody and of hymn singing from its springs to its present fulness. *But no by-stream of Hymnody has been consciously neglected.*" The italics are ours, but we believe that they emphasize a truth—a truth which tells its own story in regard to the scholarly instincts of our author. One is interested

to find a fair and sympathetic discussion not only of a highly literary movement such as that of the early nineteenth century, which led to the comment: "Either poetry is growing more religious, or religion more poetical" (p. 455f.), but also of such opposite movements as produced *The Camp Meeting Hymn* (p. 291f.) and *The Gospel Hymn* (p. 482f.). Our author has given his careful attention not only to the dignified, theologically didactic hymns of the liturgical churches, but also, to instance no other types, to the characteristically emotional hymns of the Negroes (pp. 306, 307) and to those which express the "intense sectarianism" of *Mormon Hymnody* (p. 431f.). A broad-minded thoroughness always characterizes his work, and each individual reader can with reasonable confidence expect to find whatever aspect of the subject is at the moment commanding his special interest, treated with a considerable degree of fulness.

Dr. Benson's scholarly attitude is also illustrated in his persistent use of historical sources. "It will be evident," he says (Preface, p. IX), "that for the purposes of such a study the hymn books in actual use in the different churches at various times become our principal sources, and that they, with the proceedings of the authoritative bodies in the several denominations and the lives and works of hymn writers, constitute the materials which we have to handle. The recovery of these materials, notably of the hymn books, from the litter of the past is no light task; and it is only after twenty-five years of assiduous collecting that the present writer has ventured to bring his studies to so much of a conclusion as is here attained. He can at least aver that he has dealt with his sources at first hand."

An incidental indication of Dr. Benson's care in the use of his sources is found in the fact that not only are all these hymn books cited by name and under their original titles, but in most cases the publisher and the year of publication are also given. Another evidence of the scholarly spirit is his constant reference to the writings of other authorities on the subject of hymnology. A collocation of his footnotes will furnish an extended bibliography covering the whole field of his research.

Indeed, it may be that a perhaps too vigorous and exclusive adherence to the scholarly and scientifically historical attitude has detracted somewhat from the fascination of this book for the

average reader. Many will miss features which are so familiar in the typical books on hymnology, namely, the quotation and discussion of individual hymns, and the citation of illuminative incidents in connection with the circumstances of their composition or from the lives of their authors. One cannot but feel that the human interest of this book would have been immeasurably increased if these vitalizing touches had been added to the wealth of valuable material which has been brought together. Perhaps Dr. Benson felt compelled to omit references of this sort owing to the fact that his book had already assumed such large proportions. There are 590 pages in the body of the book, a preface, a table of contents which is so complete as to be really equivalent to a syllabus, and a concluding index which fills thirty-four closely printed pages. The book indeed bulks large. But one could wish that the author had either attempted less, or done more. And this reviewer entertains the hope that some day we may have still another reconstruction and enlargement of Dr. Benson's painstaking work. It is a genuine privilege to be instructed by a writer whose every page reflects such breadth of sympathy, patience in research, and discrimination in judgment.

JAMES COFFIN STOUT.

THE HISTORY OF THE FAMILY AS A SOCIAL AND EDUCATIONAL INSTITUTION*

IN THIS book the author has given us a genetic study of the human family and has traced its rise from the early primitive life, with its problems of marriage, child exposure, child culture, and the gradual elevation of the position of woman from the status of mere property or chattel to that of free economic and political equality. As these questions have been unfolded he has mirrored the history of civilization in its various stages, in so far as it has to do with the fundamental ideals of society, the education of children, the inheritance of property, and the privileges of society. The book is a distinct contribution to the study of the

*The History of the Family as a Social and Educational Institution, by Willystine Goodsell, Ph. D. New York, 1915. Pp. 600.

family and reveals as ideals social conditions that are almost beyond belief. As the author uses the term family, he makes it follow the Western idea, referring to father, mother, and offspring, and the development of the gens of the Greeks and Romans, or the clan of the American Indians. He presents the origin of marriage as probably lying in the utter helplessness of the newborn offspring and asserts that marriage itself appears to have its source in the family rather than the family its source in marriage.

Bachofen's theory of original sex communism, resulting in the descent of property and family through the female and in the establishment of a matriarchate where women were ruling forces of primitive society, is made the point of departure in the discussion of the primitive family. "The conclusion by most contemporary social writers is that the patriarchal family, far from being the original social unit, is a comparatively recent development in the long history of family organization" (p. 11). Evidence goes to show that even when name, rank, and property descended through the mother she was not always the controlling force in the household.

"The custom of wife purchase, which is well nigh universal among savage tribes, also played its part in lowering the position of woman in the family. A woman once bought and paid for in cattle or other property used for barter, inevitably came to be regarded as a chattel from which the largest economic returns in labor must be wrung" (p. 20f.). Add to this the practice of wife capture in the almost constant warfare waged by primitive groups, and one can see the gradual loss of position of the early woman.

Until comparatively recent years the question of marriage has been commonly regarded as a private contract, and as such could be dissolved at the will of one or both of the parties. The study of the question of divorce runs through the entire book, being treated in its successive stages of development in a way both scholarly and interesting. The various forms and ceremonies in marriage are written so fully that the text could be well used as a manual for the presentation of these ceremonies in dramatic form. The gradual introduction of the authority of the church and the state as representing the community and social welfare is very clearly developed, and, as these elements enter, the

marriage ceremonies and the ceremonials for divorce grow more and more elaborate.

Through the influence of the church the laws of marriage, divorce, and child protection were gradually but completely changed, and during the predominance of the church in the Middle Ages there was a gradual bettering of the status of woman. With the Renaissance came the enlargement of liberty for the woman as she was left more and more in complete control of the affairs of the household. The effects of feudalism and of chivalry had given woman a valuable experience which taught her something of the inherent power resident within her. The whole phenomenon of the Renaissance, with its extensions in territory and in industrial experiment, had its direct effect upon the family, and in frontier communities made woman practically the co-partner of man. With the development of the education of woman conditions changed very rapidly. New lines of industry opened, the household arts and crafts with their home-made products were replaced by the factory, occupations of women were rapidly thrown outside the home, specializations in industry multiplied, seasonal occupations grew, and as the result the solidarity of the family of the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries was largely supplanted by instability.

"It is a far cry from the closely knit, highly unified family organizations of the ancient Romans, or the Middle-Age Teutons to the more loosely organized household of modern times wherein each member tends to claim independence as an individual with a personality to be developed and respected. * * * At present it is rather rare for a single will to impose itself upon every member of the family * * *. The family unity of modern times * * * is more a spiritual oneness, of mutual love and consideration, of common interests and goals than a unity secured by centering all authority in one head. * * * The family of the twentieth century is markedly unstable * * *.

"The social literature of the age abounds in references to this instability of the modern family organization * * *. With the breakup of the economic, religious and legal bonds that once made of the monogamic family a strong unit, we are assured that looser and less permanent forms of association will in all probability take its place" (p. 456f.). In substantiating this prediction Dr.

Goodsell cites the growth of divorce in these words: "As early as 1885 more marriages were dissolved in this country than in all the rest of the Christian world combined, the figures being as follows: United States, 23,472; Christian Europe, 20,131. * * * From 1890 to 1900 the number of divorces obtained increased 66.6 per cent. over the preceding decade, whereas the population increased only 20.7 per cent." (p. 457f.).

The causes for these divorces are grouped largely under desertion, adultery, and cruelty, but a careful study of desertion shows economic conditions as basic, such as low wages, seasonal trades, among which now is classed farm labor, the growing class of sailors and railroad employees, who must be absent from home the greater part of the time. The present situation is aggravated by the frequent necessity for leaving the home and entering employment during seasons of depression and the idleness in seasonal employments, on the part of the women and children of the family. Another factor militating against the home life is the economic dependence of the wife and the failure to "realize that women, like men, are *individuals*, with tastes and abilities varying widely, and with the desire, becoming every year more conscious and more urgent, to make those capacities count for something in carrying forward the world's work. This is, of course, the outcome of the individualistic movement, born in the eighteenth century, and perhaps not yet full-grown" (p. 465).

The author adroitly calls attention to the fact that domestic life and domesticity are not synonymous terms, and, in discussing the occupation of the woman outside the home, he justifies very largely her ambition and her interest as the result of the individualistic tendency which is furthered by current educational and professional or business training, especially for girls of the upper and lower middle classes.

Another phase of the economic problem developing rapidly within the last fifty years is "the phenomenon of the parasitic wife." "Idleness in women is the beginning of trouble. It is just as bad for their morals as it is for men's—perhaps a little worse" (quoted from Warbasse, *Medical Sociology*, p. 119). Again ignorance of sexual life and hygiene and the double standard of moral conduct result in tendencies toward disintegration of the family. The rate of marriage and the control of

child birth enter as present problems of the family régime, and Dr. Goodsell presents statistical data showing the effects of these conditions.

In the chapter on Current Theories of Reform the author has given a splendid summary of the theories of the radicals, conservatives, and moderate progressives as to family regeneration. Anyone interested in the development of the suffragist or the feminist movement will find in this chapter a clear statement of the theories of the various reformers, with a concise counter statement or question put by the author, and he closes his book with a presentation of present reforms through new social legislation and with a plea to parents and teachers to "bend their efforts to secure sounder knowledge, truer idealism, a firmer self-control, for the young men and young women of our land who are to be the husbands and wives, the fathers and mothers of the coming generation. * * * In an age of domestic unrest every thoughtful man and woman should inform himself or herself on questions concerned with the family institution and exercise such influence as he or she may possess to deepen the respect in which it is held by the public in general, as well as to bring about needed reforms in its operation" (p. 550).

JOHN ANDERSON WOOD.

PATIENCE WORTH*

TO BE called upon to pass judgment upon the literary productions of a spiritual personality, whose inspiration is drawn from the "great boundless" on the other side of the grave, is an undertaking to which a mere mundane critic turns with much hesitation and many misgivings. Yet this is the peculiar task which falls to the lot of the reviewer of *Patience Worth*. For *Patience Worth* claims to be an inhabitant of the spiritual world, having lived "many moons ago" in England, presumably about the year 1649. The account of her first reappearance and introduction is given as follows: "In July, 1913, Mrs. John H. Curran, wife of a former Immigration Commissioner of Missouri, and Mrs. Emily Grant Hutchings, wife of the Secretary of the Tower Grove Park Board

**Patience Worth*, by Casper S. Yost. New York, 1916. Pp. 290.

of St. Louis, were amusing themselves with a ouija board, when out of a clear sky came: 'Many moons ago I lived. Again I come. Patience Worth my name.'"

From the hour of this most startling introduction Patience Worth has been in constant attendance upon Mrs. Curran. Whenever she has seated herself at the ouija board—for the novel feature about Patience's communications is that she gives them only through the ouija board, and through this only when Mrs. Curran is one of the operators—it matters not the time or occasion or the surrounding group. Patience Worth is always present and gladly gives audience. Her communications fall into a wide variety of literary forms, conversations, poems, allegories, short plays, a long mediæval drama, and two novels.

The author of our book tells us that "the personality of Patience Worth is manifested through the instrumentality of the ouija board, and her striking individuality is thereby as vividly expressed as if she were present in the flesh. Whatever she may be, she is at hand. Nor does she have to be solicited. The moment the fingers are on the board she takes command. She seems fairly to jump at the opportunity to express herself." To be sure it comes with something of a shock, and it takes somewhat of the glamour and lure from the "great beyond" to learn that its inhabitants, even after the "great change," still remain capable of indulging in the trivial bantering which makes up many of the conversations of Patience Worth. One is also impressed with her all too human temper. But worst of all, it surprises us to find that celestial beings are condemned to spend their days dancing attendance upon a mortal woman with a ouija board. Yet, if the end to be gained through this humiliation is worth it all, this phase of the problem can be overlooked.

With regard to this part of the problem our author remarks: "And now we well may ask: What is the purpose of all this? * * * Is there any intimation or assertion of a definite purpose? * * * If we may assume that Patience is what she seems to be—a voice from another world, then indeed we may discern a purpose. She has a message to deliver, and she gives the impression that she is a messenger. * * * What then is her message? For answer it may be said that it is at once a revelation, a religion, and a promise."

Such an attractive announcement leads the eager reader to a perusal of these communications with a keen and almost uncanny anticipation of bursting in upon some startling revelations from the other world, the like of which we mortals have never before known, and which by the very uniqueness of their character will stamp them as unquestioned messages from beyond the vale. But if this is the expectation of the reader he is doomed to disappointment. For the revelation, the religion, and the promise which Patience Worth transmits through her communications are strangely vague, nebulous, and unsatisfactory. She adds nothing new, she makes not a single original contribution in thought or idea, nor does she increase by one iota the sum total of our present knowledge in any one of these lines. The truth is that even the old which she restates does not at any point come up to that already in our possession.

The ground upon which the author bases the claim for the genuineness of the existence of Patience Worth as a real spiritual personality is, first, the literary character and quality of her communications; second, the archaic form of her speech and writings.

With regard to the first it must be confessed that Patience Worth's communications do not possess such transcendent literary superiority that they surpass the limits of human genius. In fact, while there are to be found here and there occasional flashes that possess fresh charm, they nowhere rise above the level of the ordinary. There is not among them a type of literary composition which has not been many, many times excelled by mere mundane writers. It does impress one as an unnecessary waste of celestial and terrestrial literary energy to employ the joint time and gifts of Mrs. Curran and Patience Worth to give to our world messages which have been already so much better given by unaided human genius.

With regard to the archaic character of her speech and writings the same thing is true. When analyzed, these turn out to be the simplest kinds of primitive archaic forms. They are produced by superficial twists, for the most part, into which one might easily, consciously or unconsciously, fall. It should be noted in this connection that the archaic quality grows distinctly less as the confidence, experience, and skill of the author increases.

One cannot help feeling that, if Mrs. Curran has placed all the data and information in her possession in the hands of those who are trying to unravel this "psychic mystery"—and no one seems to question her honesty and sincerity—then the problem resolves itself into a familiar psychological one. The true explanation must wait for complete data. But in the present stage of its presentation it bears all the marks of a case of automatism.

Concerning this phenomenon Sir Oliver Lodge, a friend of the psychic, in his book, *Science and Immortality*, says: "It would be a great mistake to assume, without proof, that any given automatic message really emanates from the person to whom it is attributed; and such a generalization applied to all so-called messages would be grotesquely untrue. * * * Sometimes the controlling intelligence belongs to a living person, as in the cases of hypnotism; more usually it is an influence emanating from what we must consider some portion of the automatist's own larger or subliminal self. Occasionally a person appears able to respond to thoughts or stimuli embedded, as it were, among the psychophysical surroundings in a manner at present ill understood, and almost incredible" (p. 178f.).

There is nothing in the recorded experiences of Mrs. Curran and her ouija board which demands, for its explanation, the intervention of a superhuman or spiritual personality. Much more remarkable phenomena have arisen from purely psychological sources. If the progress and development which have so rapidly manifested themselves in the growing ability of Mrs. Curran in the use of her ouija board continue, the time will undoubtedly come when she herself will discover the true identity of Patience Worth, and find her to be a normal child of that already numerous and distinguished family of fictional literary characters, born of the genius of the creative imagination.

A. C. WYCKOFF.

Announcement

Forthcoming issues of THE BIBLICAL REVIEW will contain, among other excellent papers:

PHILOSOPHY AND LIFE. By DR. GEORGE TRUMBULL LADD, of Yale University.

THE UBIQUITY OF THE MESSIAHSHIP IN THE GOSPELS. By DR. GEERHARDUS VOS, of Princeton Seminary.

HEAD AND HEART. By RT. REV. H. C. G. MOULE, Bishop of Durham.

THE SPIRITUAL FAILURE OF CLASSIC CIVILIZATION. By DR. E. G. SIHLER, of New York University.

ON LOVING OUR ENEMIES. By REV. RICHARD ROBERTS, of London.

NEW TESTAMENT EVANGELISM. By PROFESSOR W. H. GRIFFITH THOMAS, of Wycliffe College.

REDEMPTION. By PROFESSOR J. M. T. WINTHER, of the Lutheran Seminary, Kumamoto, Japan.

WHY THE SPRINGS FAIL. By DR. WILLIAM ELLIOT GRIFFIS.

CHRISTIAN HISTORY IN RELATION TO THE ART OF PAINTING—THE SIXTEENTH AND SEVENTEENTH CENTURIES. By REV. T. H. WRIGHT, late of Dresden.

Also, EXCEPTIONALLY VALUABLE EXPOSITORY ARTICLES, by able scholars.

Include this REVIEW in your reading for the coming fall and winter

ONE DOLLAR A YEAR

(Foreign Postage, Thirty Cents Extra)

THE BIBLICAL REVIEW
541 LEXINGTON AVENUE NEW YORK